arXiv:1603.06663v1 [stat.ME] 22 Mar 2016

On the Statistical Inference for Large Precision Matrices with Dependent Data

Jinyuan Chang
School of Mathematics and Statistics
The University of Melbourne
Parkville, VIC, Australia 3010
Email: jinyuan.chang@unimelb.edu.au

Yumou Qiu
Department of Statistics
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0963, USA
Email: yumouqiu@unl.edu

Qiwei Yao
Department of Statistics
London School of Economics
London, WC2A 2AE, UK.
E-mail: q.yao@lse.ac.uk

23 March 2016

Abstract

Precision matrices play important roles in many statistical applications. Motivated by the increasingly complex dependence in data acquired in modern social and scientific studies, we consider the statistical inference for precision matrices with time dependent observations under ultra high-dimensional settings. More specifically, let $\mathbf{\Omega}$ be the precision matrix and $\mathcal{S}$ be a given index set of interest. We propose a data-driven procedure to construct a class of confidence regions $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}$ for $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $\sup_{0<\alpha<1}|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}) - \alpha| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, where $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a vector whose components are the elements of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ indexed by $\mathcal{S}$. Such constructed confidence regions can be applied to solve several statistical problems of interest, for example, testing for specific structures of $\mathbf{\Omega}$, detecting and recovering the nonzero components in $\mathbf{\Omega}$, and so on. The proposed procedure includes two steps. We first derive an estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ for $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ via penalized node-wise regressions, and then approximate the probabilistic behavior of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_{\infty}$ by that of the l_{∞}-norm of an ultra high-dimensional normal distributed random vector with mean zero and covariance formulated as an estimate for the long-run covariance of an unobservable process. Our analysis shows that the kernel-type estimator initially suggested by Andrews (1991) for the fixed dimensional long-run covariance can be also employed in the proposed procedure for the ultra high-dimensional scenario without imposing any additional stringent structural assumptions on the long-run covariance. Owing to the form of the kernel-type estimator, we develop a computationally feasible algorithm to implement the proposed procedure. Theoretical results indicate that the proposed procedure works well

even without imposing the stationary assumption on the data. Numerical studies confirm the performance of the proposed approach in finite samples.

Keywords: Bias correction; Dependent data; Gaussian approximation; High dimensionality; Kernel estimation; Parametric bootstrap; Precision matrix.

1 Introduction

With an ever-increasing capacity to collect and store data, industry, business and government offices all encounter the task of analyzing the data of unprecedented size arisen from various practical problems such as panel studies of economic, social and natural (such as weather) phenomena, financial market analysis, genetic studies and communications engineering. One significant feature of these data is that the number of variables recorded in each observation is extremely large. Meanwhile, most real data evidence that different observation units over time are temporal dependent. Therefore, many well-developed statistical inference methods for independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) data do not work any more here. Those features of modern data bring both opportunities and challenges to statisticians and econometricians.

Covariance matrices provide a measure for the marginal dependence among variables. There are a set of recent works on estimation and hypothesis testing of ultra high-dimensional covariances with i.i.d. data. See Bickel and Levina (2008a,b), Li and Chen (2012), Cai, Liu and Xia (2013) and references therein. Compared with the marginal dependence, the conditional dependence captures the direct "link" between two variables when the other variables are conditioned on, which demonstrates the interaction between variables. Gaussian graphical model (GGM) is a widely used tool to model and analyze the conditional dependence relationship among components of a random vector. Under the Gaussian assumption the precision matrix, defined as the inverse of the covariance matrix, provides an equivalent representation for the conditional dependence. Therefore, analyzing an ultra high-dimensional GGM can be transformed to investigate the structures of the associated ultra high-dimensional precision matrix. Beyond the Gaussian assumption, the bijection relationship between the conditional dependence and the precision matrix might not hold, however, the precision matrix still plays an important role in many statistical applications. For illustration, the analysis of linear regression models, the Kalman recursions in state-space models, and partial correlation graphs. See Examples 1–3 in Section 2 for more details.

Several methods have been proposed to estimate a high-dimensional precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$ with i.i.d. data in the recent few years. Graphical Lasso (Yuan and Lin, 2007; Friedman, Hastie and Tibshirani, 2008) is a penalized likelihood estimation approach with an L_1 penalty on the entries of $\mathbf{\Omega}$. Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2006) introduced a neighborhood selection approach, which estimates $\mathbf{\Omega}$ by finding the nonzero regression coefficients of each variable on all other variables via Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) or Dantzig estimator (Candes and Tao, 2007). See also Cai, Liu and Luo (2011), Xue and Zou (2012) and Sun and Zhang (2013) for other penalized methods. Chen, Xu and Wu (2013) investigated the theoretical properties of graphical Lasso with time dependent

data. Even though the above mentioned methods can estimate $\mathbf{\Omega}$ consistently, they cannot provide statistical inference for $\mathbf{\Omega}$ due to a non-negligible bias term incurred by the penalized methods. Recent progress has been made to overcome this issue. Under the Gaussian assumption, Ren et al. (2015) proposed a novel estimator for each entry of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ based on the residuals from fitting an L_1 penalized regression to the corresponding pair of variables using all the rest variables as predictors, and showed their procedure does not incur a bias term. Although their estimator shares some good theoretical advantages, it requires to fit $\frac{p(p-1)}{2}$ ultra high-dimensional regressions, which is computational intensive when p is large. Liu (2013) proposed a bias corrected estimator for $\mathbf{\Omega}$ based on only p node-wise regressions with Gaussian distributed data. However, neither of these two approaches consider time dependent observations or global level inference for a target sub-region of $\mathbf{\Omega}$. Such global inference is essential to understand the structure of the precision matrix. To this end, a precise asymptotic expansion of the estimator is required, which is missing in the previous literatures.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a given index set of interest, and n be the sample size. The main goal of this paper is to propose a data-driven procedure to determine a class of confidence regions $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}$ for $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ with time dependent data in ultra high-dimensional scenarios such that $\sup_{0<\alpha<1} |\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}) - \alpha| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, where $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a vector whose components are the elements of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ indexed by $\mathcal{S}$. Such constructed confidence regions are of great practical importance in many statistical applications. For example, it can be used to test for some specific structures of $\mathbf{\Omega}$, to detect and recover the nonzero components in $\mathbf{\Omega}$ consistently, and to construct the simultaneous confidence intervals for the elements in $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$. We first propose a bias corrected estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ for $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ via penalized node-wise regressions, and then investigate its asymptotic expansion without imposing either Gaussian or stationary assumption on the data. Based on the obtained asymptotic expansion, the leading term of $n(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})$ takes the form of the partial sum of a certain process. For any $\mathbf{A} = (a_{j_1,j_2})$, denote by $|\mathbf{A}|_\infty = \max_{j_1,j_2} |a_{j_1,j_2}|$ the elementwise l_∞-norm of $\mathbf{A}$. Inspired by the Gaussian approximation of Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato (2013, 2014), we approximate the probabilistic behavior of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ by that of the l_∞-norm of an ultra high-dimensional normal distributed random vector with mean zero and covariance formulated as an estimate for the long-run covariance of an unobservable process. In practice, we apply the idea of parametric bootstrap to generate a set of independent samples from such defined multivariate normal distribution, and then use the empirical distribution of the L_∞-norm of these generated random vectors to characterize the probabilistic behavior of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$. Our analysis shows that the kernel-type estimator initially suggested by Andrews (1991) for the fixed dimensional long-run covariance still works in the proposed procedure for the ultra high-dimensional scenario without imposing any additional stringent structural assumptions on the long-run covariance. Owing to the form of the kernel-type estimator, we construct a computationally feasible algorithm to implement the proposed procedure. As we will discuss in Section 3, such a procedure has four significant advantages: (i) it is fully data-driven; (ii) it is adaptive to any structure of the long-run covariance; (iii) it significantly reduces the computational and storage costs in generating bootstrap samples; and (iv) it performs better in approximating the distribution of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ in finite samples than

the limiting distribution of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ does. More importantly, there is no guarantee for the existence of the limiting distributions for such L_∞-type statistics in general. The existence of such limiting distributions usually require additional stringent assumptions that are restrictive and difficult to verify in practice. As an advantage, our procedure is free of those assumptions. Both theoretical and numerical results demonstrate the promising properties of the proposed procedure.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the problem to be solved and its background. The proposed procedure and its theoretical properties are given in Section 3. Section 4 discusses the applications of our results. Simulation studies are reported in Section 5. All the technical proofs are relegated to the Appendix. At the end of this section, we introduce the notations used in this paper here. Let $|\mathcal{B}|$ be the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{B}$. For an $s_1 \times s_2$ matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{j_1,j_2})$ and an index set $\mathcal{A} \subset \{1,\ldots,s_1\} \times \{1,\ldots,s_2\}$ with $q = |\mathcal{A}|$, we denote by $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$ a q-dimensional vector where the components of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are a_{j_1,j_2}'s indexed by $\mathcal{A}$. Recall we defined before, $|\mathbf{A}|_\infty = \max_{j_1,j_2} |a_{j_1,j_2}|$ denotes the elementwise L_∞-norm of $\mathbf{A}$. When $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a} = (a_1,\ldots,a_{s_1})^{\mathrm{T}}$ is an s_1-dimensional vector, we define $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $|\mathbf{a}|_\infty$ in the same way with $s_2 = 1$. Let $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ be the indicator function. Let $|\mathbf{a}|_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} \mathbb{I}(a_j \neq 0)$ and $|\mathbf{a}|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} |a_j|$ be the L_0- and L_1-norms of $\mathbf{a}$, respectively.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1,\ldots,y_p)^{\mathrm{T}}$ be a p-variate random vector with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. Let $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}$ be the precision matrix. Assume that $\mathcal{Y}_n = \{\mathbf{y}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{y}_n\}$ be an observed sample of size n from an $\mathbb{R}^p$-valued time series, where $\mathbf{y}_t = (y_{1,t},\ldots,y_{p,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$ and each $\mathbf{y}_t$ has the same first two moments as $\mathbf{y}$, i.e. $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_t) = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbf{y}_t) = \mathbf{\Sigma}$ for each t. We assume the temporal dependence among $\{\mathbf{y}_t\}$ satisfies the β-mixing condition such that $\beta_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, where

$$\beta_k = \sup_t \mathbb{E}\bigg\{ \sup_{B \in \mathscr{F}_{t+k}^{\infty}} \big|\mathbb{P}(B|\mathscr{F}_{-\infty}^{t}) - \mathbb{P}(B)\big| \bigg\}.$$

Here $\mathscr{F}_{-\infty}^{t}$ and $\mathscr{F}_{t+k}^{\infty}$ are the σ-fields generated respectively by $\{\mathbf{y}_u\}_{u \le t}$ and $\{\mathbf{y}_u\}_{u \ge t+k}$. The β-mixing condition is a mild assumption in time series literature. It is well known that causal ARMA processes with continuous innovation distributions, stationary Markov chains under some mild conditions and stationary GARCH models with finite second moments and continuous innovation distributions all satisfy the β-mixing condition. We refer to Section 2.6 of Fan and Yao (2003) for detailed discussion on β-mixing.

Given a precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} = (\omega_{l_1,l_2})_{p\times p}$ and an index set $\mathcal{S} \subset \{1,\ldots,p\}^2$ with $r = |\mathcal{S}|$, we are interested to construct a class of confidence regions $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha})_{0<\alpha<1}$ for the components of $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ such that

$$\sup_{0<\alpha<1} \big|\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}) - \alpha\big| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty \tag{1}$$

in the ultra high-dimensional scenario. As we will discuss in Section 4, such confidence regions can be employed to (i) test for specific structures of $\mathbf{\Omega}$, and (ii) detect and recover the nonzero

components in $\mathbf{\Omega}$ consistently. Before introducing the methodology to determine $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}$ specified in (1), we first give some interpretation on the motivation of our focus in this paper through the following examples.

Example 1. (High-dimensional linear regression) Let z_t and $\mathbf{x}_t = (x_{1,t}, \ldots, x_{m,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$ be, respectively, the response variable and explanatory variables with zero mean. Suppose that z_t and $\mathbf{x}_t$ are linear related as $z_t = \mathbf{x}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \varepsilon_t$ with $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_t\varepsilon_t) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $t = 1, \ldots, n$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m)^{\mathrm{T}} = \{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_t\mathbf{x}_t^{\mathrm{T}})\}^{-1}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_t z_t)$ is the true regression coefficients. The coefficient γ_l stands for the lth covariate effect on the response variable. In high-dimensional regression analysis, one goal is to separate zero covariate effects with the non-zero ones. Consider to test

$$H_0 : \gamma_l = 0 \ \text{ for any } l \in \mathcal{A} \qquad \text{v.s.} \qquad H_1 : \gamma_l \neq 0 \ \text{ for some } l \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{A} \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$ is a given index set. This testing problem can be formulated in the framework of the study in this paper. Write $\mathbf{y}_t = (z_t, \mathbf{x}_t^{\mathrm{T}})^{\mathrm{T}}$ and denote by $\mathbf{\Omega} = (\omega_{l_1,l_2})_{p\times p}$ the precision matrix of $\mathbf{y}_t$. It can be shown that $(\omega_{1,2}, \ldots, \omega_{1,p})^{\mathrm{T}} = -c\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ for $c = [\mathrm{Var}(z) - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}z)\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}})\}^{-1}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}z)]^{-1} > 0$. Thus, testing (2) is equivalent to testing

$$H_0 : \omega_{1,l} = 0 \ \text{ for any } l \in \mathcal{S} \qquad \text{v.s.} \qquad H_1 : \omega_{1,l} \neq 0 \ \text{ for some } l \in \mathcal{S} \tag{3}$$

with $\mathcal{S} = \{(1, l) : l - 1 \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

Example 2. (Kalman recursions in the state-space model) In recent years state-space representations and the associated Kalman recursions have a profound impact on time series analysis and many related areas. Precision matrices are important in analyzing multivariate state-space models. Denote by $\mathrm{WN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K})$ denote a vector white noise with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance $\mathbf{K}$. A state-space model for a multivariate time series $\{\mathbf{y}_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ consists two equations:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{W}_t, \\ \mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{V}_t, \end{cases}$$

where $\{\mathbf{x}_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ is a v-dimensional unobserved state process, $\{\mathbf{W}_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty} \sim \mathrm{WN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R})$, $\mathbf{G}$ is a $p \times v$ unknown matrix, $\mathbf{F}$ is a $v \times v$ unknown matrix, and $\{\mathbf{V}\}_{t=1}^{\infty} \sim \mathrm{WN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{Q})$ which is uncorrelated with $\{\mathbf{W}_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$. Let $\mathbf{J}_t = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}_t\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{T}} + \mathbf{R}$ be the variance of one-step ahead forecast error given $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i<t}$, where $\mathbf{A}_t = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{A}_{t-1}\mathbf{F}^{\mathrm{T}} + \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{B}_{t-1}\mathbf{J}_{t-1}^{-1}\mathbf{B}_{t-1}^{\mathrm{T}}$ with $\mathbf{B}_t = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{A}_t\mathbf{G}^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the filtering variance of $\mathbf{x}_t$ given $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i<t}$. The quantity $\mathbf{J}_t^{-1}$ is involved in three fundamental problems associated with the state-space model: prediction, filtering and smoothing. Under the steady-state solution assumption that $\mathbf{A}_t$ is independent of t, we can compute $\mathbf{J}_t$ ($t \geq 2$) via $\mathbf{J}_1$. Notice that $\mathbf{J}_1 = \mathrm{Var}(\mathbf{y}_1)$, thus $\mathbf{J}_1^{-1}$ is essentially the precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$. A good estimate for $\mathbf{\Omega}$ will lead to good performance of Kalman recursions under ultra high-dimensional settings.

To obtain a good estimate for $\mathbf{\Omega}$, some prior structural information of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ will be helpful. Bandness is one special structure of precision matrices. In many practical problems, the variables have a natural ordering that are related to the ones in their neighborhood. For instance, sales, prices and weather indices depend more on those at close range locations. The information from

further locations may become redundant given that from neighbors. See, for example, se Can and Megbolugbe (1997) for a house price data example which exhibits such a dependence structure. In those cases, there exists a constant $k > 0$ such that $\omega_{l_1,l_2} = 0$ for any $|l_1 - l_2| > k$. To explore and confirm such a structure, we consider the hypothesis testing problem

$$H_0 : \omega_{l_1,l_2} = 0 \ \text{ for any } |l_1 - l_2| > k \qquad \text{v.s.} \qquad H_1 : \omega_{l_1,l_2} \neq 0 \ \text{ for some } |l_1 - l_2| > k \tag{4}$$

for some positive integer k which may diverge to infinity as $n, p \to \infty$. Bickel and Levina (2008a) proposed banding the Cholesky decomposition factor matrix to estimate the ultra high-dimensional bandable $\mathbf{\Omega}$. Testing the hypothesis (4) is a practical guideline to confirm if $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is within the bandable class so that the banding estimator can be applied. If the banded hypothesis is confirmed by the test, the banding estimators may be employed.

Example 3. (Partial correlation network) Given a precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} = (\omega_{l_1,l_2})_{p\times p}$, we can define an undirected network $G = (V, E)$ where the vertex set $V = \{1, \ldots, p\}$ represents the p components of $\mathbf{y}$ and the edge set $E = \{(l_1, l_2) \in V \times V : \omega_{l_1,l_2} \neq 0\}$ are the pairs of variables with non-zero precision coefficients. Let $\rho_{l_1,l_2} = \text{Corr}(\varepsilon_{l_1}, \varepsilon_{l_2})$ be the partial correlation between the L_1-th and the l_2-th components of $\mathbf{y}$ for any $l_1 \neq l_2$, where ε_{l_1} and ε_{l_2} are the errors of the best linear predictors of y_{l_1} and y_{l_2} given $\mathbf{y}_{-(l_1,l_2)} = \{y_k : k \neq l_1, l_2\}$, respectively. It is known that $\rho_{l_1,l_2} = -\frac{\omega_{l_1,l_2}}{\sqrt{\omega_{l_1,l_1}\omega_{l_2,l_2}}}$. Therefore, the network $G = (V, E)$ also represents the partial correlation graph of $\mathbf{y}$. The vertices $(l_1, l_2) \notin E$ if and only if y_{l_1} and y_{l_2} are partially uncorrelated. Additionally, if $\mathbf{y}$ follows a multivariate normal distribution, such a network G is a Gaussian graphical model, which indicates the conditional dependence structure among the components of $\mathbf{y}$.

Neighborhood and community are two basic features in a network. The neighborhood of the l-th vertex, denoted by $\mathcal{N}_l$, is the set of all the vertices directly connected to it. For most of the spatial data, it is believed that the partial correlation neighborhood is related to the spatial neighborhood. Let $\mathcal{N}_l(k)$ be the set including the first k closest vertices to the l-th vertex in the spatial domain. To investigate such a relationship, we consider to test $H_0 : \mathcal{N}_l = \mathcal{N}_l(k)$ versus $H_1 : \mathcal{N}_l \neq \mathcal{N}_l(k)$ for some pre-specified positive constant k. A community in a network is a group of vertices that have heavier connectivity within the group than outside the group. The community structure builds the fundamental architecture of a network. Empirical evidence in the analysis of stocks data indicates that the returns of the stocks from a same sector are highly correlated. Intuitively, the partial correlation of the returns between two stocks from different sectors should be small. Hence, the sectors can be regarded as different communities in the stock return network. In brain connectivity studies, it has been shown in literature that the brain anatomical regions have dense connection within each lobes, which is conisdered as a community. The between-lobe connections are much fewer. However, those between-lobe connections are still important in brain operating and information processing. It has been found that some neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's Disease and Autism Spectrum Disorder, have missing between-lobe connectivities compared with normal healthy individuals. Therefore, it is of practical importance to explore the connectivity between different communities. Assume the p

components of $\mathbf{y}$ are decomposed into K disjoint communities $V_1, \ldots, V_K$. We are interested to recover $\mathcal{D} = \{(k_1, k_2) : \omega_{l_1,l_2} \neq 0 \text{ for some } l_1 \in V_{k_1} \text{ and } l_2 \in V_{k_2}\}$.

3 Main results

3.1 Estimation of $\mathbf{\Omega}$

To state our methodology, we first revisit the relationship between the precision matrix and node-wise regressions. For a random vector $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_p)^{\mathrm{T}}$ with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, we consider p node-wise regressions

$$y_{l_1} = \sum_{l_2 \neq l_1} \alpha_{l_1,l_2} y_{l_2} + \epsilon_{l_1} \quad (l_1 = 1, \ldots, p). \tag{5}$$

The regression error ϵ_{l_1} is uncorrelated with $\mathbf{y}_{-l_1}$ if and only if $\alpha_{l_1,l_2} = -\frac{\omega_{l_1,l_2}}{\omega_{l_1,l_1}}$ for any $l_2 \neq l_1$. For such specified regression coefficients, it can be shown that $\mathrm{Cov}(\epsilon_{l_1}, \epsilon_{l_2}) = \frac{\omega_{l_1,l_2}}{\omega_{l_1,l_1}\omega_{l_2,l_2}}$ for any l_1 and l_2. Let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_p)^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\mathbf{V} = \mathrm{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = (v_{l_1,l_2})_{p\times p}$. The precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is proportional to $\mathbf{V}$ as $\mathbf{\Omega} = \{\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{V})\}^{-1}\mathbf{V}\{\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{V})\}^{-1}$. See Lemma 1 of Peng et al. (2009) for the above result. This relationship between $\mathbf{\Omega}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ provides a way to learn $\mathbf{\Omega}$ by the regression errors in (5).

Since the error vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ in (5) is unobservable in practice, its "proxy" – the residuals of the node-wise regressions – can be used to estimate $\mathbf{V}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l = (\alpha_{l,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{l,l-1}, -1, \alpha_{l,l+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{l,p})^{\mathrm{T}}$. For each $l = 1, \ldots, p$, we fit the ultra high-dimensional linear regression

$$y_{l,t} = \sum_{k \neq l} \alpha_{l,k} y_{k,t} + \epsilon_{l,t} \quad (t = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{6}$$

by Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), Dantizg estimation (Candes and Tao, 2007) or scaled Lasso (Sun and Zhang, 2012). For simplicity, we present our results under Lasso estimator. Other estimators can be applied similarly. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l$ be the Lasso estimator of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l$ defined as follows:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \Theta_l} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} (\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{y}_t)^2 + 2\lambda_l |\boldsymbol{\gamma}|_1 \right], \tag{7}$$

where $\Theta_l = \{\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_p)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \gamma_l = -1\}$ and λ_l is the tuning parameter. For each t, the residual

$$\widehat{\epsilon}_{l,t} = -\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{y}_t \tag{8}$$

provides an estimate of $\epsilon_{l,t}$. Write $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t = (\widehat{\epsilon}_{1,t}, \ldots, \widehat{\epsilon}_{p,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$ and let $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}} = (\widetilde{v}_{l_1,l_2})_{p\times p}$ be the sample covariance of $\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t\}_{t=1}^n$, where $\widetilde{v}_{l_1,l_2} = n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t}$. It is well known that $n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}$ is an unbiased estimator of v_{l_1,l_2}, however, replacing $\epsilon_{l_1,t}$ by $\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}$ will incur a bias term. Specifically, as shown in Lemma 3 in Appendix, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{v}_{l_1,l_2} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t} = &-(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2} - \alpha_{l_1,l_2})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l_2,t}^2\right)\mathbb{I}(l_1 \neq l_2) \\ &-(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_2,l_1} - \alpha_{l_2,l_1})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l_1,t}^2\right)\mathbb{I}(l_1 \neq l_2) + o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Here the higher order term $o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}$ holds uniformly for any l_1 and l_2. Since $n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l,t}^2$ is $n^{1/2}$-consistent to $v_{l,l}$, (9) implies that $\widetilde{v}_{l,l}$ is also $n^{1/2}$-consistent to $v_{l,l}$. However, for any $l_1 \neq l_2$, due to the slow convergence rates of the Lasso estimators $\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_{l_2,l_1}$, $\widetilde{v}_{l_1,l_2}$ is no longer $n^{1/2}$-consistent to v_{l_1,l_2}. To eliminate the bias, we employ a new estimator below for v_{l_1,l_2}:

$$\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_2} = \begin{cases} -\dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{t=1}^n (\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t} + \widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t}^2 + \widehat{\alpha}_{l_2,l_1}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}^2), & l_1 \neq l_2; \\ \dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{t=1}^n \widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t}, & l_1 = l_2. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

By noticing that $\mathbf{\Omega} = \{\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{V})\}^{-1}\mathbf{V}\{\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{V})\}^{-1}$, we estimate ω_{l_1,l_2} as

$$\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2} = \frac{\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_2}}{\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_1}\widehat{v}_{l_2,l_2}} \tag{11}$$

for any l_1 and l_2. The following proposition gives the asymptotic expansion of $\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}$.

Proposition 1. *Let $s = \max_{1\le l\le p}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_0$ and select the tuning parameter λ_l in (7) satisfying $\lambda_l \asymp (n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}$ for each $l = 1,\ldots,p$. Under Conditions 1–3 given in Appendix, if $s^2(\log p)^3 n^{-1} = o(1)$ and $\log p = o(n^{\varrho_1})$ for a positive constant ϱ_1 specified in the proof of this proposition in Appendix, it holds that*

$$\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2} - \omega_{l_1,l_2} = -\frac{\delta_{l_1,l_2}}{v_{l_1,l_1}v_{l_2,l_2}} + o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\},$$

where $\delta_{l_1,l_2} = n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n(\epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t} - v_{l_1,l_2})$ for any l_1 and l_2, and $o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}$ is a uniform higher order term.

We see from Proposition 1 that such defined $\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}$ is centered at the true parameter value ω_{l_1,l_2} with a standard deviation at the order $n^{-1/2}$. Ren et al. (2015) proposed an estimator for ω_{l_1,l_2} via pairwise regression. Specifically, they fitted each pair of variables (y_{l_1}, y_{l_2}) on all other variables $\mathbf{y}_{-(l_1,l_2)}$ via scaled Lasso, which requires $\frac{p(p-1)}{2}$ ultra high-dimensional regressions. As a comparison, our proposed estimator (10) only needs p regressions, which dramatically reduces the computation burden when p is large. Liu (2013) employed $-n^{1/2}c_{l_1,l_2}\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_2}$ for $\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_2}$ defined in (10) and some specified scale c_{l_1,l_2} as the statistic to detect whether $\omega_{l_1,l_2} = 0$ or not. He showed that $n^{1/2}c_{l_1,l_2}(-\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_2} + \frac{b_{l_1,l_2}\omega_{l_1,l_2}}{\omega_{l_1,l_1}\omega_{l_2,l_2}})$ is asymptotically normal distributed with some random variable b_{l_1,l_2}, which indicates the asymptotical normality of $-n^{1/2}c_{l_1,l_2}\widehat{v}_{l_1,l_2}$ only when $\omega_{l_1,l_2} = 0$. However, such a result under $\omega_{l_1,l_2} = 0$ is not sufficient to construct confidence regions for the non-zero ω_{l_1,l_2}'s. The asymptotic expansion of $\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}$ in Proposition 1 is a more delicate result, which is necessary for our analysis.

3.2 Confidence regions

Let $\mathbf{\Delta} = -n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbf{V})$. It follows from Proposition 1 that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}} - \mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{\Pi} + \mathbf{\Upsilon} \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{\Pi} = \{\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{V})\}^{-1}\mathbf{\Delta}\{\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{V})\}^{-1},$$

where $|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}|_\infty = o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}$. Restricted on a given index set $\mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}} = \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}} + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{12}$$

Based on (12), we consider two choices below for the confidence regions $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha}$ specified in (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1} &= \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^r : n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{a}|_\infty \le q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2} &= \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^r : n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{a})|_\infty \le q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$ is an $r \times r$ diagonal matrix specified later in Remark 5 of which the elements are the estimated standard derivations of the r components in $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})$. Here $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$ and $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}$ are two critical values to be determined. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}$ represent the so-called "non-Studentized-type" and "Studentized-type" confidence regions for $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$, respectively. As comment by Chang, Zhou and Zhou (2014), the Studentized-type confidence regions perform better than the non-Studentized-type ones when the heteroscedasticity exists, however, the performance of the non-Studentized confidence regions is more stable when the sample size n is fairly small.

In the sequel, we mainly focus on estimating the critical value $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$ in (13). By the same way, $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}$ can be estimated similarly, which will be discussed in Remark 5 later. To determine $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$, we need to first characterize the probabilistic behavior of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$. Since $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a higher order term, $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ will behave similarly as $n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ when n is large. For each t, let $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t$ be an r-dimensional vector whose l-th element is $\frac{\epsilon_{\chi_1(l),t}\epsilon_{\chi_2(l),t} - v_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(l)}}{v_{\chi_1(l),\chi_1(l)}v_{\chi_2(l),\chi_2(l)}}$ where $\boldsymbol{\chi}(\cdot) = (\chi_1(\cdot), \chi_2(\cdot))$ is a bijective mapping from $\{1,\ldots,r\}$ to $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\omega_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(1)},\ldots,\omega_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(r)})^{\mathrm{T}}$. Then we have

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t.$$

Denote by $\mathbf{W}$ the long run covariance of $\{\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t\}_{t=1}^n$, namely,

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t\Big)^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\}. \tag{14}$$

The next theorem shows that the probabilistic behavior of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ can be approximated by that of $|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty$ for $\boldsymbol{\xi} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W})$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\xi} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W})$ for $\mathbf{W}$ specified in* (14)*. Under the conditions of Proposition* 1 *and Condition* 4 *given in Appendix, we have*

$$\sup_{x>0}\big|\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) - \mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty > x)\big| \to 0 \quad \textit{as} \quad n \to \infty,$$

provided that $s^2(\log p)^3 n^{-1} = o(1)$ and $\log p = o(n^{\varrho_2})$ where $s = \max_{1\le l\le p}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_0$ and ϱ_2 is a positive constant specified in the proof of this theorem in Appendix.

Remark 1. Theorem 1 shows that the Kolmogorov distance between the distributions of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ and $|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty$ converges to zero in the ultra high-dimensional scenario. More specifically, as shown in the proof of Theorem 1 in Appendix, this convergence rate is $O(n^{-C})$ for some constant

$C > 0$. Under certain conditions, the L_∞-type statistic $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ will converge weakly to some kind of extreme distribution. However, such convergence usually requires some stringent assumptions on the underlying covariance/correlation structures and suffers from low accuracy as the rate of convergence to the extreme distribution is fairly slow. Taking the extreme distribution of type I as an example, the convergence rate is of order $O\{\log(\log n)/\log n\}$. These defects may cause the poor performance of the limiting distribution calibration approach for the L_∞-type statistic in finite samples. However, our approximation strategy does not require such stringent assumptions and has faster convergence rate.

Theorem 1 provides a guideline to approximate the distribution of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$. To implement it in practice, we need to propose an estimator for $\mathbf{W}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = (\eta_{1,t}, \ldots, \eta_{r,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$ where $\eta_{l,t} = \epsilon_{\chi_1(l),t}\epsilon_{\chi_2(l),t} - v_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(l)}$. Then $\mathbf{W}$ specified in (14) can be written as

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{H}\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\bigg)\bigg(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\bigg)^{\mathrm{T}}\bigg\}\mathbf{H} \tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{H} = \mathrm{diag}\{v^{-1}_{\chi_1(1),\chi_1(1)}v^{-1}_{\chi_2(1),\chi_2(1)}, \ldots, v^{-1}_{\chi_1(r),\chi_1(r)}v^{-1}_{\chi_2(r),\chi_2(r)}\}$. Denote by $\mathbf{\Xi}$ the matrix sandwiched by $\mathbf{H}$'s on the right-hand side of (15), which is the long-run covariance of $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\}_{t=1}^n$. Notice that $\widehat{v}_{\ell,\ell}$ defined in (10) is $n^{1/2}$-consistent to $v_{\ell,\ell}$, we can estimate $\mathbf{H}$ by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{H}} = \mathrm{diag}\big\{\widehat{v}^{-1}_{\chi_1(1),\chi_1(1)}\widehat{v}^{-1}_{\chi_2(1),\chi_2(1)}, \ldots, \widehat{v}^{-1}_{\chi_1(r),\chi_1(r)}\widehat{v}^{-1}_{\chi_2(r),\chi_2(r)}\big\}. \tag{16}$$

Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t = (\widehat{\eta}_{1,t}, \ldots, \widehat{\eta}_{r,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$ for $\widehat{\eta}_{l,t} = \widehat{\epsilon}_{\chi_1(l),t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{\chi_2(l),t} - \widehat{v}_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(l)}$, and define

$$\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_k = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}}, & k \geq 0; \\ \dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{t=-k+1}^{n}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t+k}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t^{\mathrm{T}}, & k < 0. \end{cases}$$

Based on the $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_k$'s, we propose a kernel-type estimator suggested by Andrews (1991) for $\mathbf{\Xi}$ as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{\Xi}} = \sum_{k=-n+1}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\bigg(\frac{k}{S_n}\bigg)\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_k \tag{17}$$

where S_n is the bandwidth, $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ is a symmetric kernel function that is continuous at 0 and satisfying $\mathcal{K}(0) = 1$, $|\mathcal{K}(u)| \leq 1$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathcal{K}^2(u)du < \infty$. Given $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{\Xi}}$ defined respectively in (16) and (17), an estimator for $\mathbf{W}$ is given by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}} = \widehat{\mathbf{H}}\widehat{\mathbf{\Xi}}\widehat{\mathbf{H}}. \tag{18}$$

In finite samples, Theorem 2 below shows that we can approximate the distribution of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ by that of $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty$ for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \widehat{\mathbf{W}})$.

Remark 2. Andrews (1991) systematically investigated the theoretical properties of such a kind of estimators in the fixed dimensional framework, and shows that the Quadratic Spectral kernel

$$\mathcal{K}_{QS}(u) = \frac{25}{12\pi^2u^2}\bigg\{\frac{\sin(6\pi u/5)}{6\pi u/5} - \cos(6\pi u/5)\bigg\}$$

is the optimal one for estimating the long-run covariance in the sense of minimizing the asymptotic truncated mean square error. A data-driven bandwidth selection procedure for the Quadratic Spectral kernel was studied in Section 6 of Andrews (1991), which can be computed efficiently. We will adopt the Quadratic Spectral kernel $\mathcal{K}_{QS}(\cdot)$ with its data-driven bandwidth selection procedure in our numerical studies. Both our theoretical and simulation results show that this kernel estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}$ performs very well even in ultra high-dimensional scenarios. There also exist various other estimation methods for long-run covariances, including the estimators utilizing the moving block bootstraps (Lahiri, 2003; Nordman and Lahiri, 2005). See also Den Han and Levin (1997) and Kiefer, Vogelsang and Bunzel (2000). Compared to those methods, the kernel-type estimators applied in our procedure have two advantages. First, it does not require the stationary assumption imposed on $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\}_{t=1}^n$. Second, the form of kernel-type estimator given in (17) can be applied to simplify the data generating mechanism for an ultra high-dimensional Gaussian random vector with covariance $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$, and therefore can significantly improve the computational efficiency when p is large. See Remark 4 later for more detailed discussion on the computational issues.

Theorem 2. *Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \widehat{\mathbf{W}})$ for $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ specified in* (18)*. Assume the kernel function $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ satisfy $|\mathcal{K}(x)| \asymp |x|^{-\tau}$ as $x \to \infty$ for some $\tau > 1$, and the bandwidth $S_n \asymp n^{\rho}$ for some $0 < \rho < \min\{\frac{\tau-1}{3\tau}, \frac{\gamma_3}{2\gamma_3+1}\}$ and γ_3 in Condition* 3*. Under the conditions of Theorem* 1*, it holds that*

$$\sup_{x>0} \left|\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) - \mathbb{P}\big(|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty > x|\mathcal{Y}_n\big)\right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad as \quad n \to \infty$$

provided that $s^2(\log p)n^{-1}\max\{S_n^2, (\log p)^2\} = o(1)$ and $\log p = o(n^{\varrho_3})$ where $s = \max_{1\le l\le p}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_0$ and ϱ_3 is a positive constant specified in the proof of this theorem in Appendix.

Remark 3. From the theoretical property of the Gaussian approximation technique proposed by Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato (2013), we know the result stated in Theorem 2 is valid for any $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ satisfying $|\widehat{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{W}|_\infty = o_p(1)$. The proposed procedure requires the estimation of an ultra high-dimensional covariance matrix $\mathbf{W}$. However, different from the widely used estimators in the literature of the ultra high-dimensional covariance estimation, our procedure does not need some specific structural assumptions, such as sparsity or bandableness, imposed on $\mathbf{W}$. This advantage widens the applications of the proposed method.

In finite samples, we can use the Monte Carlo simulation to approximate the distribution of $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty$ given the data $\mathcal{Y}_n$. Specifically, let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_M$ be i.i.d. r-dimensional random vectors drawn from $N(\mathbf{0}, \widehat{\mathbf{W}})$. Then the conditional distribution of $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty$ given $\mathcal{Y}_n$ can be approximated by the empirical distribution of $\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_1|_\infty, \ldots, |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_M|_\infty\}$, namely,

$$\widehat{F}_M(x) = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathbb{I}\big\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_m|_\infty \le x\big\}.$$

Then, $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$ specified in (13) can be estimated by

$$\widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1} = \inf\{x : \widehat{F}_M(x) \ge 1-\alpha\}. \tag{19}$$

To improve computational efficiency, we propose the following Kernel based Multiplier Bootstrap (KMB) procedure to generate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$:

Step 1. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a $n \times n$ matrix whose (i,j)-th element is $\mathcal{K}(|i-j|/S_n)$, and generate a n-dimensional Gaussian random vector $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \ldots, g_n)^{\mathrm{T}}$ with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance $\mathbf{A}$.

Step 2. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = n^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(\sum_{t=1}^{n} g_t \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t)$ where $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ is defined in (16).

It is easy to see that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \widehat{\mathbf{W}})$ given $\mathcal{Y}_n$. Note that this KMB procedure only requires to generate an n-dimensional Gaussian random vector in each bootstrap sample.

Remark 4. The classical approach to draw a random vector $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \widehat{\mathbf{W}})$ consists of three steps: (i) perform the Cholesky decomposition on the $r \times r$ matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{W}} = \mathbf{L}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}$, (ii) generate r independent standard normal random variables $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_r)^{\mathrm{T}}$, (iii) perform transformation $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \mathbf{L}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{z}$. Thus, it requires to store matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t\}_{t=1}^n$, which amounts to the storage costs $O(r^2)$ and $O(rn)$, respectively. The computational complexity is $O(r^2 n + r^3)$, mainly due to computing $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ and the Cholesky decomposition. When $r = O(p^2)$ and p is large, the classical approach requires intensive computation and high storage. However, the new data generating mechanism KMB makes our procedure practically feasible even when p is large. Notice that the proposed KMB procedure only needs to store $\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t\}_{t=1}^n$ and $\mathbf{A}$, and draw an n-dimensional random vector $\mathbf{g} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A})$ in each bootstrap sample, which amounts to total storage cost $O(rn + n^2)$. More significantly, the computational complexity of the KMB procedure is only $O(n^3)$ which is independent of r and p.

Remark 5. For the Studentized-type confidence regions $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}$ defined in (13), we can choose the diagonal matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{D}} = \{\mathrm{diag}(\widehat{\mathbf{W}})\}^{1/2}$ for $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ specified in (18). Correspondingly, for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{W}}\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1})$, it can be proved similarly to Thorem 2 that

$$\sup_{x>0} \left| \mathbb{P}\{n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty > x\} - \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty > x | \mathcal{Y}_n) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Thus, to approximate the distribution of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty$, we only need to replace the Step 2 in the KMB procedure by

Step 2′. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = n^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(\sum_{t=1}^{n} g_t \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t)$ where $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}$ is defined in (16).

Based on the i.i.d. random vectors $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_M$ generated by Step 1 and Step 2′, we can estimate $q_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}$ via $\widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,2}$, which is calculated the same as $\widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$ in (19). We call the procedure combining Step 1 and Step 2′ as Studentized Kernel based Multiplier Bootstrap (SKMB).

4 Applications

4.1 Testing structures of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$

As discussed in Section 2, in many statistical applications, we are interested in exploring and detecting some specific structures of the precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = (\omega_{l_1,l_2})_{p\times p}$. Given an index set $\mathcal{S}$ of interest and a set of pre-specified constants $\{c_{l_1,l_2}\}$, we consider to test the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \omega_{l_1,l_2} = c_{l_1,l_2} \ \text{ for any } (l_1,l_2) \in \mathcal{S} \qquad \text{v.s.} \qquad H_1 : \omega_{l_1,l_2} \neq c_{l_1,l_2} \ \text{ for some } (l_1,l_2) \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(1)}, \ldots, c_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(r)})^{\mathrm{T}}$. A usual choice of $\mathbf{c}$ is the zero vector, corresponding to the test for non-zero structures of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. Given a prescribed level $\alpha \in (0,1)$, define $\Psi_\alpha = \mathbb{I}\{\mathbf{c} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\}$ for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}$ specified in (13). Then, we reject the null hypothesis H_0 at level α if $\Psi_\alpha = 1$. This procedure is equivalent to the test based on the L_∞-type statistic $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{c}|_\infty$ that rejects H_0 if $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{c}|_\infty > \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}$. L_∞-type statistics are widely used in testing ultra high-dimensional means and covariances. See, for example, Cai and Jiang (2011) and Cai, Liu and Xia (2013). The following corollary gives the empirical size and power of the proposed testing procedure Ψ_α.

Corollary 1. *Assume conditions of Theorem* 2 *hold. It holds that:* (i) $\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\Psi_\alpha = 1) \to \alpha$ *as* $n \to \infty$*;* (ii) *if* $\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{S}} |\omega_{l_1,l_2} - c_{l_1,l_2}| \geq C(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2} \max_{1\leq l\leq r} w_{l,l}^{1/2}$ *where* $w_{l,l}$ *is the* l*-th component in the diagonal of* $\mathbf{W}$ *defined in* (14)*, and* C *is a constant larger than* $\sqrt{2}$*, then* $\mathbb{P}_{H_1}(\Psi_\alpha = 1) \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

From Corollary 1, we see that the empirical size of the proposed testing procedure Ψ_α will converge to its nominal level under H_0. Due to the slow convergence rate of the L_∞-type statistic to its limiting distribution (see Remark 1), applying the limiting distribution calibration to determine the critical value for the test statistic $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{c}|_\infty$ will suffer from the size distortion. Since the KMB procedure enjoys much faster convergence rate, the proposed test Ψ_α will have more accurate size. Corollary 1 also demonstrates the proposed Ψ_α is a consistent test if the maximal signal strength $\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{S}} |\omega_{l_1,l_2} - c_{l_1,l_2}|$ is larger than $C(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}$ for some positive constant C. Similarly, we can also define Ψ_α via replacing $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}$ by its "Studentized-type" analogue $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,2}$ specified in (13).

4.2 Support recovering of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$

In studying partial correlation networks or GGMs, a common interest is to identify the edges between nodes. This is equivalent to recover the non-zero components in the associated precision matrix. Let $\mathcal{M}_0 = \{(l_1,l_2) : \omega_{l_1,l_2} \neq 0\}$ be the set of indices with non-zero precision coefficients. Choose $\mathcal{S} = \{1,\ldots,p\}^2$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},\alpha,1}$ provides simultaneous confidence intervals for all entries ω_{l_1,l_2}'s in $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. To recover the set $\mathcal{M}_0$ consistently, we choose those precision coefficients whose confidence intervals do not include zero. For any vector $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,\ldots,u_r)^{\mathrm{T}}$, let $\mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{u}) = \{l : u_l \neq 0\}$ be the support set of $\mathbf{u}$. For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\chi}^{-1}(l) : l \in \bigcap_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}} \mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \right\}$$

be the estimate of $\mathcal{M}_0$.

In our context, note that the false positive means estimating the zero ω_{l_1,l_2} as non-zero. Let FP be the number of false positive errors conducted by the estimated signal set $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha}$. Let the family wise error rate (FWER) be the probability of conducting any false positive errors, namely, FWER $= \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{FP} > 0)$. See Hochberg and Tamhane (2009) for various types of error rates in multiple testing procedures. Notice that $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{FP} > 0) \leq \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}) = \alpha\{1 + o(1)\}$.

This shows that the proposed method is able to control family wise error rate at level α for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$. The following corollary further shows the consistency of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha}$.

Corollary 2. *Assume conditions of Theorem* 2 *hold, and the signals satisfy* $\min_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0}|\omega_{l_1,l_2}| \geq C(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\max_{1\leq l\leq r} w_{l,l}^{1/2}$ *where* $w_{l,l}$ *is the* l*-th component in the diagonal of* $\mathbf{W}$ *defined in* (14)*, and* C *is a constant larger than* $\sqrt{2}$*. Selecting* $\alpha \to 0$ *such that* $1/\alpha = o(p)$*, it holds that* $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha} = \mathcal{M}_0) \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$*.*

From Corollary 2, we see that the selected set $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha}$ can identify the true set $\mathcal{M}_0$ consistently if the minimum signal strength $\min_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{S}}|\omega_{l_1,l_2}|$ is larger than $C(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}$ for some positive constant C. Similarly, we can also define $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha}$ via replacing $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}$ by its "Studentized-type" analogue $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,2}$ in (13).

5 Numerical study

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the proposed KMB and SKMB procedures in finite samples. Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n$ be i.i.d. p-dimensional samples from $N(\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. The observed data were generated from the model $\mathbf{y}_1 = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1$ and $\mathbf{y}_t = \rho\mathbf{y}_{t-1} + (1-\rho^2)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$. The parameter ρ was set to be 0 and 0.3, which captures the temporal dependence among observations. We chose the sample size $n = 150$ and 300, and the dimension $p = 50$ and 100 in the simulation. Let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \{\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*^{-1})\}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*\{\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*^{-1})\}^{1/2}$ for some a positive definite matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*$. The following two settings were considered for $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_* = (\sigma^*_{l_1,l_2})_{1\leq l_1,l_2\leq p}$.

A. Let $\sigma^*_{l_1,l_2} = 0.5^{|l_1-l_2|}$ for any $1 \leq l_1, l_2 \leq p$.

B. Let $\sigma^*_{l,l} = 1$ for any $l = 1,\ldots,p$, $\sigma^*_{l_1,l_2} = 0.5$ for $5(h-1)+1 \leq l_1 \neq l_2 \leq 5h$, where $h = 1,\ldots,p/5$, and $\sigma^*_{l_1,l_2} = 0$ otherwise.

Structures A and B lead to, respectively, the banded and block diagonal structures for the precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$. Note that, based on such defined covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, the diagonal elements of the precision matrix are unit. For each of the precision matrices, we consider two choices for the index set $\mathcal{S}$: (i) all zero components of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1,j_2) : \omega_{j_1,j_2} = 0\}$, and (ii) all the components excluded the ones on the main diagonal, $\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1,j_2) : j_1 \neq j_2\}$. From the asymptotic expansion of $\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}$ given in Proposition 1, under the Gaussian assumption of $\mathbf{y}_t$, it holds that $\mathrm{Var}\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2} - \omega_{l_1,l_2})\} = \frac{1+\rho^2}{1-\rho^2}\{1+o(1)\}$ for any (l_1,l_2) satisfying $\omega_{l_1,l_2} = 0$. Therefore, the index sets $\mathcal{S}$ in the setting (i) and (ii) mimic, respectively, the homogeneous and heteroscedastic cases for the variances of $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2} - \omega_{l_1,l_2})$ among $(l_1,l_2) \in \mathcal{S}$.

For each of the cases above, we examined the accuracy of the proposed KMB and SKMB approximations to the distributions of the non-Studentized-type statistic $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ and the Studentized-type statistic $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty$, respectively. More specifically, we first draw 5000 independent samples where each sample with size n was generated by the above discussed data generating mechanism. We then computed $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ and $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty$ in each sample and employed their empirical distributions as the benchmark for their true distributions.

For $\alpha = 0.075, 0.050$ and 0.025, we applied the KMB and SKMB procedures in each sample to estimate the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ quantiles of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}}-\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ and $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}}-\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty$, respectively, with bootstrap resampling $M = 3000$ in each of the procedures. Based on the benchmark distributions of $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}}-\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ and $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}}-\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty$ given before, we computed the associated empirical coverages for the estimated quantiles in each sample. We report the averages and standard deviations of such determined 5000 empirical coverages in Tables 1 and 2 for the cases $p = 50$ and $p = 100$, respectively.

From the two tables, we observe that, for both KMB procedure and SKMB procedure, the overall differences between the empirical coverage rates and the corresponding nominal levels are small, which demonstrates that the KMB and SKMB procedures can provide accurate approximations to the distributions of $\sqrt{n}|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty$ and $n^{1/2}|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}})|_\infty$, respectively. Also note that the coverage rates improve as n increases. And, our results are robust to the temporal dependence parameter ρ, which indicates the proposed procedures are adaptive to time dependent observations.

Comparing the simulation results indicated by KMB and SKMB in the category $\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : j_1 \neq j_2\}$ of Tables 1 and 2, we can see that the SKMB procedure has better accuracy than the KMB procedure when the heteroscedastic issue exists. For the homogeneous case $\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : \omega_{j_1,j_2} = 0\}$, the KMB procedure provides better accuracy than the SKMB procedure when sample size is small ($n = 150$). However, when the sample size becomes larger ($n = 300$), the accuracy of the SKMB procedure can be significantly improved and it will outperform the KMB procedure. This phenomenon might be caused by incorporating $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$, the estimated variances of $\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}$'s, in the denominator of the Studentized statistic, which suffers from high variability when the sample size is small. The simulation results suggest us that: (i) the SKMB procedure should be used to construct the confidence regions of $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$ if the heteroscedastic issue exists; (ii) if the sample size is small, and we have some previous information that there does not exist heteroscedastic, then the KMB procedure should be used to construct the confidence regions of $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$. However, even in the homogeneous case, the SKMB procedure still should be employed when the sample size is large.

Appendix

To prove the theoretical results of our method, we need following regularity conditions.

Condition 1. There exist constants $K_1 > 0$, $K_2 > 1$, $0 < \gamma_1 \leq 2$ and $0 < \gamma_2 \leq 2$ such that

$$\max_{1\leq l\leq p} \mathbb{E}\{\exp(K_1|y_{l,t}|^{\gamma_1})\} \leq K_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1\leq l\leq p} \mathbb{E}\{\exp(K_1|\epsilon_{l,t}|^{\gamma_2})\} \leq K_2$$

for each $t = 1, \ldots, n$.

Condition 2. The smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is uniformly bounded away from zero.

Condition 3. There exists constants $K_3 > 0$ and $\gamma_3 > 0$ such that

$$\beta_k \leq \exp(-K_3 k^{\gamma_3})$$

for any positive k.

Condition 4. There exist constants $K_4 > 0$ and $\iota > 0$ such that

$$K_4^{-1} < \liminf_{b\to\infty} \inf_{1\le\ell\le n+1-b} \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{b^{1/2}} \sum_{\ell\le t\le \ell+b-1} \eta_{l,t}\right|^{2+\iota}\right)$$
$$\le \limsup_{b\to\infty} \sup_{1\le\ell\le n+1-b} \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{b^{1/2}} \sum_{\ell\le t\le \ell+b-1} \eta_{l,t}\right|^{2+\iota}\right) < K_4$$

for each $l = 1, \ldots, p$.

Throughout the Appendix, C denotes a generic positive constant depending only on the constants specified in Conditions 1–4, that may be different in different uses. Let $\rho_1^{-1} = 2\gamma_1^{-1} + \gamma_3^{-1}$, $\rho_2^{-1} = 2\gamma_2^{-1} + \gamma_3^{-1}$ and $\rho_3^{-1} = \gamma_1^{-1} + \gamma_2^{-1} + \gamma_3^{-1}$. Define $\zeta = \min\{\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3\}$ and $\mathbf{\Delta} = n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbf{V} =: (\delta_{l_1,l_2})$.

Lemma 1. *Assume Conditions* 1–3 *hold. If* $\log p = o(n^{\zeta/(2-\zeta)})$*, there exists a uniform constant* $A_0 > 1$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\{|\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{\Sigma}|_\infty > A_1(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} \le \exp\{-CA_1^{\rho_1}(n\log p)^{\rho_1/2}\} + \exp(-CA_1^2\log p),$$

$$\mathbb{P}\{|\mathbf{\Delta}|_\infty > A_2(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} \le \exp\{-CA_2^{\rho_2}(n\log p)^{\rho_2/2}\} + \exp(-CA_2^2\log p),$$

$$\sup_{1\le l\le p} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l,t}^2 > A_3 v_{l,l}\right) \le \exp(-CA_3^{\rho_2} n^{\rho_2}),$$

$$\sup_{1\le l\le p} \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{k\ne l}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \epsilon_{l,t}y_{k,t}\right| > A_4(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\right\} \le \exp\{-CA_4^{\rho_3}(n\log p)^{\rho_3/2}\} + \exp(-CA_4^2\log p),$$

for any $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 > A_0$.

Proof: For any given l_1 and l_2, following the same arguments of Lemma 2 in Chang, Tang and Wu (2013), the first part of Condition 1 and Markov inequality imply that

$$\sup_{1\le t\le n} \mathbb{P}\big(|y_{l_1,t}y_{l_2,t} - \sigma_{l_1,l_2}| > x\big) \le C\exp(-Cx^{\gamma_1/2}) \text{ for any } x > 0.$$

Hence, for any $x > 0$ such that $nx \to \infty$, Theorem 1 of Merlevède, Peligrad and Rio (2011) leads to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n y_{l_1,t}y_{l_2,t} - \sigma_{l_1,l_2}\right| > x\right) \le n\exp(-Cn^{\rho_1}x^{\rho_1}) + \exp(-Cnx^2).$$

By Bonferroni inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(|\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{\Sigma}|_\infty > x\big) \le np^2\exp(-Cn^{\rho_1}x^{\rho_1}) + p^2\exp(-Cnx^2).$$

Let $x = A_1(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}$, we obtain the first conclusion. Following the same arguments stated above, we can establish the other inequalities. □

Lemma 2. *Assume Conditions* 1–3 *hold. Let* $s = \max_{1\le l\le p}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_0$. *For some suitable* $\lambda_l \asymp (n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}$ *for each* $l = 1,\ldots,p$, *we have*

$$\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1 = o_p\{(\log p)^{-1}\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_2 = o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/4}\}$$

provided that $\log p = o(n^{\zeta/(2-\zeta)})$ *and* $s^2(\log p)^3 n^{-1} = o(1)$.

Proof: Define

$$\mathscr{T} = \left\{ \max_{1\le l\le p}\max_{k\neq l}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l,t}y_{k,t}\right| \le A_4(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\right\}$$

for some $A_4 > A_0$, where A_0 is given in Lemma 1. Selecting $\lambda_l \ge 4A_4(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}$ for any l, Theorem 6.1 and Corollary 6.8 of Bühlmann and van de Geer (2011) imply that, restricted on $\mathscr{T}$, we have

$$\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1 \le Cs(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2} \tag{20}$$

and

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l)^{\mathrm{T}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{-l,-l}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l) \le Csn^{-1}\log p \tag{21}$$

with probability approaching 1. By Bonferroni inequality and Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{T}^c) \le & \sum_{l=1}^{p}\mathbb{P}\left\{\sum_{k\neq l}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l,t}y_{k,t}\right| > A_4(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\right\}\\ & \le p\exp\{-CA_4^{\rho_3}(n\log p)^{\rho_3/2}\} + p\exp(-CA_4^2\log p).\end{aligned}$$

For suitable selection of A_4, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{T}^c)\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Thus, from (20), it holds that

$$\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1 = O_p\{s(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} = o_p\{(\log p)^{-1}\}. \tag{22}$$

On the other hand, notice that

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l)^{\mathrm{T}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{-l,-l}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l) \ge \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{-l,-l})|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_2^2 - |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{-l,-l} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{-l,-l}|_\infty|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1^2,$$

by Condition 2, Lemma 1, (21) and (22), we have

$$\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_2 = O_p\{(sn^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} = o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/4}\}.$$

Hence, we complete the proof. □

Lemma 3. *Assume the conditions for Lemmas* 1 *and* 2 *hold, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}\\ =& -(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2} - \alpha_{l_1,l_2})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_2,t}^2\right)\mathbb{I}(l_1\neq l_2) - (\widehat{\alpha}_{l_2,l_1} - \alpha_{l_2,l_1})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_1,t}^2\right)\mathbb{I}(l_1\neq l_2)\\ &+ o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here the remainder term $o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}$ *is uniformly for any* l_1 *and* l_2.

Proof: Notice that $\epsilon_{l,t} = -\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t$ and $\widehat{\epsilon}_{l,t} = -\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t$ for any t, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t} =& -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\epsilon_{l_2,t} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_2}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_2})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\epsilon_{l_1,t}\\ &+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\mathbf{y}_t^{\mathrm{T}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_2}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_2}).\end{aligned}$$

Condition 2, Lemmas 1 and 2 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{1\le l_1,l_2\le p}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\mathbf{y}_t^{\mathrm{T}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_2}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_2})\right|\\ &\le \max_{1\le l_1,l_2\le p}|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_2}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_2})| + \max_{1\le l_1,l_2\le p}|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_2}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_2})|\\ &\le C\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_2^2 + |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|_\infty\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1^2\\ &= o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, by Lemma 1, we have

$$\max_{1\le l\le p}\max_{k\ne l}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l,t}y_{k,t}\right| = O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{1\le l_1,l_2\le p}\left|\sum_{k\ne l_1,l_2}(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,k}-\alpha_{l_1,k})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{k,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}\right)\right| &\le \max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1\cdot\max_{1\le l\le p}\max_{k\ne l}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{k,t}\epsilon_{l,t}\right|\\ &= o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\epsilon_{l_2,t}\\ &= (\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}-\alpha_{l_1,l_2})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{l_2,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}\right)\mathbb{I}(l_1\ne l_2) + \sum_{k\ne l_1,l_2}(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,k}-\alpha_{l_1,k})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{k,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}\right) \qquad (23)\\ &= (\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}-\alpha_{l_1,l_2})\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{l_2,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}\right)\mathbb{I}(l_1\ne l_2) + o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here the remainder term is uniform for any l_1 and l_2. On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{l,t}\epsilon_{l,t} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l,t}^2 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l,-l}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_{-l,t}\epsilon_{l,t}.$$

By Lemma 1, it yields that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}y_{l,t}\epsilon_{l,t} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l,t}^2 + O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}.$$

Here the remainder term is uniform for any l. Together with (23), we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{l_1}-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{l_1})^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\epsilon_{l_2,t}=(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}-\alpha_{l_1,l_2})\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_2,t}^2\bigg)\mathbb{I}(l_1\neq l_2)+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.$$

Here the remainder term is also uniform for any l_1 and l_2. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t}-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}\\&=-(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}-\alpha_{l_1,l_2})\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_2,t}^2\bigg)\mathbb{I}(l_1\neq l_2)-(\widehat{\alpha}_{l_2,l_1}-\alpha_{l_2,l_1})\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\epsilon_{l_1,t}^2\bigg)\mathbb{I}(l_1\neq l_2)\\&\quad+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1: Notice that $v_{l_1,l_2}=\frac{\omega_{l_1,l_2}}{\omega_{l_1,l_1}\omega_{l_2,l_2}}$ and $\alpha_{l_1,l_2}=-\frac{\omega_{l_1,l_2}}{\omega_{l_1,l_1}}$ for any l_1 and l_2, (9) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\widetilde{v}_{l_1,l_2}+\frac{\widehat{\alpha}_{l_1,l_2}}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_2,t}^2+\frac{\widehat{\alpha}_{l_2,l_1}}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\widehat{\epsilon}_{l_1,t}^2+v_{l_1,l_2}\\&=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\epsilon_{l_1,t}\epsilon_{l_2,t}-v_{l_1,l_2})+\frac{\alpha_{l_1,l_2}}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\epsilon_{l_2,t}^2-v_{l_2,l_2})+\frac{\alpha_{l_2,l_1}}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\epsilon_{l_1,t}^2-v_{l_1,l_1})+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}\end{aligned}$$

for any $l_1\neq l_2$. Recall $\boldsymbol{\Delta}=n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{\mathrm{T}}-\mathbf{V}=:(\delta_{l_1,l_2})$. It follows from Lemma 1 that

$$\max_{1\leq l_1,l_2\leq p}|\delta_{l_1,l_2}|=O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}.$$

By Taylor expansion, if $\log p=o(n^{\zeta/(2-\zeta)})$ for ζ specified in Lemma 1 and $s^2(\log p)^3n^{-1}=o(1)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}-\omega_{l_1,l_2}&=\frac{v_{l_1,l_2}-\delta_{l_1,l_2}-\alpha_{l_1,l_2}\delta_{l_2,l_2}-\alpha_{l_2,l_1}\delta_{l_1,l_1}+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}}{[v_{l_1,l_1}+\delta_{l_1,l_1}+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}][v_{l_2,l_2}+\delta_{l_2,l_2}+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}]}-\frac{v_{l_1,l_2}}{v_{l_1,l_1}v_{l_2,l_2}}\\&=-\frac{\delta_{l_1,l_2}}{v_{l_1,l_1}v_{l_2,l_2}}+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}\end{aligned}$$

for any $l_1\neq l_2$. Meanwhile, by the same arguments, for each $l=1,\ldots,p$, it holds that

$$\widehat{\omega}_{l,l}-\omega_{l,l}=-\frac{\delta_{l,l}}{v_{l,l}^2}+o_p\{(n\log p)^{-1/2}\}.$$

This proves Proposition 1. □

Proof of Theorem 1: Define

$$d_1=\sup_{x>0}\big|\mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty>x)-\mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty>x)\big|.$$

For any $x > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) &\le \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x - \varepsilon_1) + \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > \varepsilon_1) \\ &\le \mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty > x - \varepsilon_1) + d_1 + \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > \varepsilon_1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty > x) + \mathbb{P}(x - \varepsilon_1 < |\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty \le x) + d_1 + \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > \varepsilon_1).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, notice that $\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) \ge \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x + \varepsilon_1) - \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > \varepsilon_1)$, following the same arguments, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{x>0} \big|\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) - \mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty > x)\big| \\ &\le d_1 + \sup_{x>0} \mathbb{P}(x - \varepsilon_1 < |\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty \le x + \varepsilon_1) + \mathbb{P}(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > \varepsilon_1).\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

By the Anti-concentration inequality for Gaussian random vector, it holds that

$$\sup_{x>0} \mathbb{P}(x - \varepsilon_1 < |\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty \le x + \varepsilon_1) \le C\varepsilon_1 (\log p)^{1/2} \tag{25}$$

for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$. From the proofs of Lemmas 2 and 3, we know $n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty = O_p(sn^{-1/2}\log p)$. Thus, if $s^2(\log p)^3 n^{-1} = o(1)$, we can select a suitable ε_1 to guarantee $\varepsilon_1(\log p)^{1/2} \to 0$ and $n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty = o_p(\varepsilon_1)$. Therefore, for such selected ε_1, (24) leads to

$$\sup_{x>0} \big|\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) - \mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty > x)\big| \le d_1 + o(1). \tag{26}$$

To prove Theorem 1, it suffices to show $d_1 \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We will show it below.

Write $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\bar{\varsigma}_1, \ldots, \bar{\varsigma}_r)^{\mathrm{T}}$ where $\bar{\varsigma}_l = n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \varsigma_{l,t}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_r)^{\mathrm{T}}$. Given a $D_n \to \infty$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma_{l,t}^+ &= \varsigma_{l,t}\mathbb{I}\{|\varsigma_{l,t}| \le D_n\} - \mathbb{E}[\varsigma_{l,t}\mathbb{I}\{|\varsigma_{l,t}| \le D_n\}], \\ \varsigma_{l,t}^- &= \varsigma_{l,t}\mathbb{I}\{|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n\} - \mathbb{E}[\varsigma_{l,t}\mathbb{I}\{|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n\}].\end{aligned}$$

Write $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^+ = (\varsigma_{1,t}^+, \ldots, \varsigma_{r,t}^+)^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^- = (\varsigma_{1,t}^-, \ldots, \varsigma_{r,t}^-)^{\mathrm{T}}$ for each t. The diverging rate of D_n will be specified later. Let L be a positive integer satisfying $L \le n/2$, $L \to \infty$ and $L = o(n)$. We decompose the sequence $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ to the following $m+1$ blocks where $m = \lfloor n/L \rfloor$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the integer truncation operator: $\mathcal{G}_\ell = \{(\ell-1)L + 1, \ldots, \ell L\}$ $(\ell = 1, \ldots, m)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{m+1} = \{mL + 1, \ldots, n\}$. Additionally, let $b > h$ be two positive integers such that $L = b + h$, $h \to \infty$ and $h = o(b)$. We decompose each $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ $(\ell = 1, \ldots, m)$ to a "large" block with length b and a "small" block with length h. Specifically, $\mathcal{I}_\ell = \{(\ell-1)L + 1, \ldots, (\ell-1)L + b\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_\ell = \{(\ell-1)L + b + 1, \ldots, \ell L\}$ for any $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, and $\mathcal{J}_{m+1} = \mathcal{G}_{m+1}$. Assume $\mathbf{u}$ is a centered normal random vector such that

$$\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_r)^{\mathrm{T}} \sim N\bigg[\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^m \mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^+\bigg)\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^+\bigg)^{\mathrm{T}}\bigg\}\bigg].$$

Our following proof includes two steps. The first step is to show

$$d_2 := \sup_{x>0} \big|\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty > x\big) - \mathbb{P}(|\mathbf{u}|_\infty > x)\big| = o(1). \tag{27}$$

And the second step is to show

$$\sup_{x>0}\left|\mathbb{P}(|\mathbf{u}|_\infty > x) - \mathbb{P}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|_\infty > x)\right| = o(1). \tag{28}$$

From (27) and (28), we have $d_1 = o(1)$.

We first show (27). Define

$$d_3 = \sup_{x>0}\left|\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^+\right|_\infty > x\right) - \mathbb{P}(|\mathbf{u}|_\infty > x)\right|.$$

Notice that $n^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}} = n^{-1/2}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^+ + n^{-1/2}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^-$, by Triangle inequality, it holds that

$$\left|n^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}|_\infty - \left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^+\right|_\infty\right| \le \left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^-\right|_\infty.$$

Similar to (24), we have

$$d_2 \le d_3 + \sup_{x>0}\mathbb{P}(x-\varepsilon_2 < |\mathbf{u}|_\infty \le x+\varepsilon_2) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^-\right|_\infty > \varepsilon_2\right) \tag{29}$$

for any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$. For each l, it follows from Davydov inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{t=1}^n \varsigma_{l,t}^-\right|^2\right) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^-)^2\} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t_1\neq t_2}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l,t_1}^-\varsigma_{l,t_2}^-) \\
&\le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^-)^2\} + \frac{C}{n}\sum_{t_1\neq t_2}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t_1}^-)^4\}]^{1/4}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t_2}^-)^4\}]^{1/4}\exp(-C|t_1-t_2|^{\gamma_3})
\end{aligned}$$

Following the arguments of Lemma 2 in Chang, Tang and Wu (2013), Conditions 1 and 4 imply that $\sup_{l,t}\mathbb{P}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > x) \le C\exp(-Cx^{\gamma_2/2})$ for any $x > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\{\varsigma_{l,t}^4\mathbb{I}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n)\} &= 4\int_0^{D_n} x^3\mathbb{P}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n)\,dx + 4\int_{D_n}^\infty x^3\mathbb{P}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > x)\,dx \\
&\le CD_n^4\exp(-CD_n^{\gamma_2/2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

By Triangle inequality and Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^-)^4\} &\le C\mathbb{E}\{\varsigma_{l,t}^4\mathbb{I}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n)\} + C[\mathbb{E}\{\varsigma_{l,t}\mathbb{I}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n)\}]^4 \\
&\le C\mathbb{E}\{\varsigma_{l,t}^4\mathbb{I}(|\varsigma_{l,t}| > D_n)\} \\
&\le CD_n^4\exp(-CD_n^{\gamma_2/2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{1\le l\le r}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n \varsigma_{l,t}^-\right|^2\right) \le CD_n^2\exp(-CD_n^{\gamma_2/2}).$$

Thus, it follows from Markov inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^-\right|_\infty > \varepsilon_2\right) &\le \frac{r}{\varepsilon_2^2}\sup_{1\le l\le r}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n \varsigma_{l,t}^-\right|^2\right) \\
&\le Cr\varepsilon_2^{-2}D_n^2\exp(-CD_n^{\gamma_2/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (25), it holds that

$$\sup_{x>0}\mathbb{P}(x-\varepsilon_2<|\mathbf{u}|_\infty\le x+\varepsilon_2)\le C\varepsilon_2(\log p)^{1/2}.$$

If we choose $\varepsilon_2=(\log p)^{-1}$ and $D_n=C(\log p)^{2/\gamma_2}$ for some sufficiently large C, then

$$\sup_{x>0}\mathbb{P}(x-\varepsilon_2<|\mathbf{u}|_\infty\le x+\varepsilon_2)+\mathbb{P}\bigg(\bigg|\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_t^-\bigg|_\infty>\varepsilon_2\bigg)=o(1).$$

Therefore, (29) implies $d_2\le d_3+o(1)$. To show (27) that $d_2=o(1)$, it suffices to prove $d_3=o(1)$. Following the proof of Proposition 1 in Chang, Zhou and Zhou (2014), to prove $d_3=o(1)$, it suffices to show

$$d_4:=\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}}\bigg|\mathbb{P}\bigg(\max_{1\le l\le r}\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\sum_{t=1}^n\varsigma_{l,t}^+>z\bigg)-\mathbb{P}\bigg(\max_{1\le l\le r}u_l>z\bigg)\bigg|\to 0.$$

By Theorem B.1 of Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato (2014), it holds that

$$d_4\le Cn^{-C}+Cm\exp(-Ch^{\gamma_3}),$$

provided that

$$hb^{-1}(\log p)^2\le Cn^{-\varpi}\ \text{ and }\ b^2D_n^2\log p+bD_n^2(\log p)^7\le Cn^{1-2\varpi}\tag{32}$$

for some $\varpi\in(0,1/4)$. As we mentioned above, $D_n\asymp(\log p)^{2/\gamma_2}$. To make p diverge as fast as possible, we can take $h\asymp(\log n)^\vartheta$ for some $\vartheta>0$. Then (32) becomes

$$\begin{cases}C(\log n)^\vartheta n^\varpi(\log p)^2\le b;\\ C(\log n)^{2\vartheta}(\log p)^{4/\gamma_2+5}\le n^{1-4\varpi};\\ C(\log n)^\vartheta(\log p)^{4/\gamma_2+9}\le n^{1-3\varpi}.\end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\log p=o(n^\varphi)$ where $\varphi=\min\big\{\frac{(1-4\varpi)\gamma_2}{4+5\gamma_2},\frac{(1-3\varpi)\gamma_2}{4+9\gamma_2}\big\}$. Notice that φ takes the supremum when $\varpi=0$. Hence, if $\log p=o(n^{\gamma_2/(4+9\gamma_2)})$, it holds that $d_4\to 0$. Then we construct the result (27).

Analogously, to show (28), it suffices to show $\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}}|\mathbb{P}(\max_{1\le l\le r}u_l>z)-\mathbb{P}(\max_{1\le l\le r}\xi_l>z)|\to 0$. Write $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ as the covariance of $\mathbf{u}$. Recall $\mathbf{W}$ denotes the covariance of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Lemma 3.1 of Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato (2013) leads to

$$\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}}\bigg|\mathbb{P}\bigg(\max_{1\le l\le r}u_l>z\bigg)-\mathbb{P}\bigg(\max_{1\le l\le r}\xi_l>z\bigg)\bigg|\le C|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}-\mathbf{W}|_\infty^{1/3}\{1\vee\log(r/|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}-\mathbf{W}|_\infty)\}^{2/3}.\tag{33}$$

We will specify the convergence rate of $|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}-\mathbf{W}|_\infty$ below. Notice that, for any $1\le l_1,l_2\le r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^m\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^+\bigg)\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^+\bigg)\bigg\}-\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^m\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}\bigg)\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}\bigg)\bigg\}\\ =&-\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^m\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^-\bigg)\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^-\bigg)\bigg\}-\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^m\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^+\bigg)\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^-\bigg)\bigg\}\\ &-\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^m\mathbb{E}\bigg\{\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^-\bigg)\bigg(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^+\bigg)\bigg\}.\end{aligned}$$

With Triangle inequality, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{+}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{+}\Big)\Big\}-\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}\Big)\Big\}\Big| \\
\le\ &\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-}\Big)\Big\}\Big|+\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{+}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-}\Big)\Big\}\Big| \\
&+\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{+}\Big)\Big\}\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

For each $\ell=1,\ldots,m$, the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-}\Big)\Big\}&=\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-})+\sum_{t_1\neq t_2}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l_1,t_1}^{-}\varsigma_{l_2,t_2}^{-}),\\
\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{+}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-}\Big)\Big\}&=\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{+}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-})+\sum_{t_1\neq t_2}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l_1,t_1}^{+}\varsigma_{l_2,t_2}^{-}),\\
\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{+}\Big)\Big\}&=\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{+})+\sum_{t_1\neq t_2}\mathbb{E}(\varsigma_{l_1,t_1}^{-}\varsigma_{l_2,t_2}^{+}).
\end{aligned}$$

Together with Triangle inequality, Davydov inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-}\Big)\Big\}\Big|\le Cb\sup_{l,t}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^{-})^4\}]^{1/2},\\
&\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{+}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{-}\Big)\Big\}\Big|\le Cb\sup_{l,t}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^{+})^4\}]^{1/4}\sup_{l,t}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^{-})^4\}]^{1/4},\\
&\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{-}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{+}\Big)\Big\}\Big|\le Cb\sup_{l,t}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^{+})^4\}]^{1/4}\sup_{l,t}[\mathbb{E}\{(\varsigma_{l,t}^{-})^4\}]^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (31), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{1\le l_1,l_2\le r}\Big|\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}^{+}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}^{+}\Big)\Big\}-\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}\Big)\Big\}\Big|\\
\le\ &CD_n\exp(-CD_n^{\gamma_2/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

By the proof of Lemma 2 in Chang, Chen and Chen (2015), we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{1\le l_1,l_2\le r}\Big|\frac{1}{mb}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_1,t}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell}\varsigma_{l_2,t}\Big)\Big\}-\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n}\varsigma_{l_1,t}\Big)\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n}\varsigma_{l_2,t}\Big)\Big\}\Big|\\
\le\ &Chb^{-2}+Cbn^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}-\mathbf{W}|_\infty\le Chb^{-2}+Cbn^{-1}+CD_n\exp(-CD_n^{\gamma_2/2})$. For b,h and D_n specified above, (33) implies $\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}}|\mathbb{P}(\max_{1\le l\le r}u_l>z)-\mathbb{P}(\max_{1\le l\le r}\xi_l>z)|\to 0$. Then we construct the result (28). Hence, we complete the proof of Theorem 1. □

Lemma 4. *Assume Conditions* 1 *and* 3 *hold, the kernel function* $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ *satisfies* $|\mathcal{K}(x)| \asymp |x|^{-\tau}$ *as* $x \to \infty$ *for some* $\tau > 1$*, and the bandwidth* $S_n \asymp n^{\rho}$ *for some* $0 < \rho < \min\{\frac{\tau-1}{3\tau}, \frac{\gamma_3}{2\gamma_3+1}\}$*. Let* $\kappa = \max\big\{\frac{1}{2\gamma_3+1}, \frac{\rho\tau-\rho+2}{\tau+1+\gamma_3}, \frac{\rho\tau+1}{\tau}\big\}$*, and* α_0 *be the maximizer for the function* $f(\alpha) = \min\{1-\alpha-2\rho, 2(\alpha-\rho)\tau-2\}$ *over* $\kappa < \alpha < 1-2\rho$*. Then*

$$\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}})\}\Big]\Big|_{\infty} = O_p\big(\{\log(pn)\}^{4/\gamma_2} n^{-f(\alpha_0)/2}\big)$$

provided that $\log p \le Cn^{C\delta}$ *where* $\delta = \min[\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_2+8}(2\alpha_0\gamma_3+\alpha-1), \frac{\gamma_2}{8}\{(\alpha_0-\rho)\tau+\alpha_0+\alpha_0\gamma_3+\rho-2\}]$.

Proof: To prove above result, we only need to construct the upper bound for

$$\sup_{1\le l_1,l_2\le r}\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\eta_{l_1,t}\eta_{l_2,t-k} - \mathbb{E}(\eta_{l_1,t}\eta_{l_2,t-k})\}\Big]\Big| > x\Big).$$

For any l_1 and l_2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\Big\{\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\eta_{l_1,t}\eta_{l_2,t-k} - \mathbb{E}(\eta_{l_1,t}\eta_{l_2,t-k})\}\Big]\Big| > x\Big\}\\
&\le \mathbb{P}\Big\{\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor}\Big|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big|\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}\psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{2}\Big\} + \mathbb{P}\Big\{\sum_{k=\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor+1}^{n-1}\Big|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big|\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}\psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{2}\Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, where $\psi_{t,(k)} = \eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t} - \mathbb{E}(\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t})$. Following the arguments of Lemma 2 in Chang, Tang and Wu (2013), it holds that

$$\sup_{0\le k\le n-1}\sup_{1\le t\le n-k}\mathbb{P}\big(|\psi_{t,(k)}| > x\big) \le C\exp(-Cx^{\gamma_2/4}) \tag{35}$$

for any $x > 0$. Notice that $S_n \asymp n^{\rho}$, we have $\max_{\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor+1\le k\le n-1}|\mathcal{K}(k/S_n)| \le Cn^{-(\alpha-\rho)\tau}$ if $\alpha > \rho$. Then, (35) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\Big\{\sum_{k=\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor+1}^{n-1}\Big|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big|\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}\psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{2}\Big\} &\le \sum_{k=\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor+1}^{n-1}\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}\psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > Cxn^{(\alpha-\rho)\tau-1}\Big)\\
&\le \sum_{k=\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor+1}^{n-1}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}\mathbb{P}\big(|\psi_{t,(k)}| > Cxn^{(\alpha-\rho)\tau-1}\big)\\
&\le Cn^2\exp\{-C(xn^{(\alpha-\rho)\tau-1})^{\gamma_2/4}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

We will specify the upper bound for $\mathbb{P}\{\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor}|\mathcal{K}(k/S_n)||n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k}\psi_{t,(k)}| > x/2\}$ below. Similar to (35), we have that

$$\sup_{1\le l_1,l_2\le r}\sup_{0\le k\le n-1}\sup_{1\le t\le n-k}\mathbb{P}(|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| > x) \le C\exp(-Cx^{\gamma_2/4}) \tag{37}$$

for any $x > 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the event $\{\sup_{0\le k\le n-1}\sup_{1\le t\le n-k}|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| > M\}$. For each $k = 0,\ldots,\lfloor Cn^{\alpha}\rfloor$, let $\psi^{+}_{t,(k)} = \eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}\mathbb{I}\{|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| \le M\} - \mathbb{E}[\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}\mathbb{I}\{|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| \le M\}]$

for $t = 1, \ldots, n-k$. Write $D = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} |\mathcal{K}(k/S_n)|$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\Big\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} \Big|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big| \Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{2} \Big\} \\
\le\ & \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{2D},\ \mathcal{T}^c \Big) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \\
\le\ & \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{4D} \Big) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \\
&+ \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \mathbb{E}[|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| \mathbb{I}\{|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| > M\}] > \frac{x}{4D} \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

From (37), we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \le Cn^2 \exp(-CM^{\gamma_2/4})$. Similar to (30), we have

$$\sup_{1\le l_1,l_2\le r} \sup_{0\le k\le n-1} \sup_{1\le t\le n-k} \mathbb{E}[|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| \mathbb{I}\{|\eta_{l_1,t+k}\eta_{l_2,t}| > M\}] \le CM \exp(-CM^{\gamma_2/4}).$$

If $DMx^{-1} \exp(-CM^{\gamma_2/4}) \to 0$, then (38) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\Big\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} \Big|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big| \Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{2} \Big\} \\
\le\ & \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)}\Big| > \frac{x}{4D} \Big) + Cn^2 \exp(-CM^{\gamma_2/4}).
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

For each $k = 0, \ldots, \lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor$, we first consider $\mathbb{P}\{n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)} > x/(4D)\}$. By Markov inequality, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)} > \frac{x}{4D} \Big) \le \exp\Big(-\frac{unx}{4D} \Big) \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \tag{40}$$

for any $u > 0$. Let L be a positive integer such that $L \asymp n^\alpha$ and $L \ge 3\lfloor Cn^\alpha \rfloor$ for C specified in (34). We decompose the sequence $\{1, \ldots, n-k\}$ to the following m blocks when $m = \lfloor n/L \rfloor$: $\mathcal{G}_\ell = \{(\ell-1)L+1, \ldots, \ell L\}$ $(\ell = 1, \ldots, m)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{m+1} = \{mL+1, \ldots, n\}$. Additionally, let $b = \lfloor L/2 \rfloor$ and $h = L - b$. We then decompose each $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ $(\ell = 1, \ldots, m)$ to a block with length b and a block with length h. Specifically, $\mathcal{I}_\ell = \{(\ell-1)L+1, \ldots, (\ell-1)L+b\}$ and $\mathcal{J}_\ell = \{(\ell-1)L+b+1, \ldots, \ell L\}$ for any $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, and $\mathcal{I}_{m+1} = \mathcal{G}_{m+1}$. Based on these notations and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \le \Big[\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \Big]^{1/2} \Big[\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{J}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \Big]^{1/2}.$$

By Lemma 2 of Merlevède, Peligrad and Rio (2011), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \\
\le\ & \prod_{\ell=1}^{m+1} \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} + CumMb \exp\{4ubM(m+1)\} \exp(-C|b-k|_+^{\gamma_3}).
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Following the inequality $e^x \le 1 + x + x^2 e^{x\vee 0}/2$ for any $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} &\le 1 + 2u^2 \mathbb{E}\Big\{ \Big(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} \psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big)^2 \Big\} \exp(4ubM) \\ &\le 1 + Cu^2 b^2 \exp(4ubM).\end{aligned}$$

Together with (41), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{\ell=1}^{m+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \\ &\le \{1 + Cu^2 b^2 \exp(4ubM)\}^{m+1} + CumMb \exp\{4ubM(m+1)\} \exp(-C|b-k|_+^{\gamma_3}) \\ &\le \exp\{Cmu^2 b^2 \exp(4ubM)\} + CumMb \exp\{4ubM(m+1)\} \exp(-C|b-k|_+^{\gamma_3}).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can obtain the same upper bound for $\mathbb{E}\{\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^m \sum_{t\in\mathcal{J}_\ell} 2u\psi^+_{t,(k)})\}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \le\ & \exp\{Cmu^2 b^2 \exp(4ubM)\} \\ &+ CumMb \exp\{4ubM(m+1)\} \exp(-C|b-k|_+^{\gamma_3}).\end{aligned}$$

We restrict $|ubM| \le C$. Notice that $b(m+1) \le 2n$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\Big\{ \exp\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} u\psi^+_{t,(k)} \Big) \Big\} \le C \exp(Cu^2 nb) + CuMn \exp(8uMn - Cn^{\alpha\gamma_3}).$$

Together with (40), notice that $D \asymp S_n \asymp n^\rho$ and $b \asymp n^\alpha$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)} > \frac{x}{4D} \Big) \le\ & C \exp(-Cun^{1-\rho}x + Cu^2 n^{1+\alpha}) \\ &+ CuMn \exp(-Cun^{1-\rho}x + 8uMn - Cn^{\alpha\gamma_3}).\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

To make the upper bound in above inequality decay to zero for some $x \to 0^+$ and $M \to \infty$, we need to require $uMn^{1-\alpha\gamma_3} \le C$. For the first term on the right-hand side of above inequality, the optimal selection of u is $u \asymp xn^{-\alpha-\rho}$. Therefore, (42) can be simplified to

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)} > \frac{x}{4D} \Big) \le C \exp(-Cn^{1-\alpha-2\rho}x^2) + C \exp(-Cn^{\alpha\gamma_3})$$

if $xMn^{1-\alpha-\alpha\gamma_3-\rho} \le C$. The same inequality also hold for $\mathbb{P}\{n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \psi^+_{t,(k)} < -x/(4D)\}$. Combining with (34), (36) and (39),

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n} \Big) \Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=k+1}^{n} \{\eta_{l_1,t}\eta_{l_2,t-k} - \mathbb{E}(\eta_{l_1,t}\eta_{l_2,t-k})\} \Big] \Big| > x \Big) \\ &\le Cn^\alpha \exp(-Cn^{1-\alpha-2\rho}x^2) + Cn^\alpha \exp(-Cn^{\alpha\gamma_3}) + Cn^2 \exp\{-C(xn^{(\alpha-\rho)\tau-1})^{\gamma_2/4}\} \\ &\quad + Cn^2 \exp(-CM^{\gamma_2/4})\end{aligned}$$

for any $x > 0$ such that $xMn^{1-\alpha-\alpha\gamma_3-\rho} \le C$. Notice that above inequality is uniformly for any l_1 and l_2, thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\bigg\{\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}})\}\Big]\Big|_\infty > x\bigg\} \\
&\le Cp^2n^\alpha\exp(-Cn^{1-\alpha-2\rho}x^2) + Cp^2n^\alpha\exp(-Cn^{\alpha\gamma_3}) + Cp^2n^2\exp\{-C(xn^{(\alpha-\rho)\tau-1})^{\gamma_2/4}\} \\
&\quad + Cp^2n^2\exp(-CM^{\gamma_2/4}).
\end{aligned}$$

To make the upper bound of above inequality converge to zero, x and M should satisfy the following restrictions:

$$\begin{cases} x \ge C\Big[\sqrt{\dfrac{\log(pn)}{n^{1-\alpha-2\rho}}} \vee \dfrac{\{\log(pn)\}^{4/\gamma_2}}{n^{(\alpha-\rho)\tau-1}}\Big], \\ M \ge C\{\log(pn)\}^{4/\gamma_2}. \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

Notice that $xMn^{1-\alpha-\alpha\gamma_3-\rho} \le C$, (43) implies that $\log p \le Cn^{C\delta}$ where $\delta = \min\{\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_2+8}(2\alpha\gamma_3 + \alpha - 1), \frac{\gamma_2}{8}\{(\alpha-\rho)\tau + \alpha + \alpha\gamma_3 + \rho - 2\}\}$. To make x can decay to zero and p can diverge at exponential rate of n, we need to assume $0 < \rho < \min\{\frac{\tau-1}{3\tau}, \frac{\gamma_3}{2\gamma_3+1}\}$ and $\kappa < \alpha < 1 - 2\rho$. Let $f(\alpha) = \min\{1-\alpha-2\rho, 2(\alpha-\rho)\tau - 2\}$ and $\alpha_0 = \arg\max_{\kappa<\alpha<1-2\rho} f(\alpha)$. We select $\alpha = \alpha_0$ and $x = C\{\log(pn)\}^{4/\gamma_2}n^{-f(\alpha_0)/2}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg\{\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}})\}\Big]\Big|_\infty > x\bigg\} \to 0.$$

Hence, we complete the proof of Lemma 4. □

Proof of Theorem 2: Similar to the proof of (28), it suffices to prove $|\widehat{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{W}|_\infty = o_p(1)$. By Lemmas 1 and 3, we have $\max_{1\le l\le p}|\widehat{v}_{l,l} - v_{l,l}| = O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}$. Notice that $v_{l,l}$'s are uniformly bounded away from zero, then $\widehat{v}_{l,l}^{-1}$'s are uniformly bounded away from infinity with probability approaching one. Thus,

$$|\widehat{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{W}|_\infty \le C|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}|_\infty + C|\widehat{\mathbf{H}} - \mathbf{H}|_\infty = C|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}|_\infty + O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}. \tag{44}$$

We will show $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}|_\infty = o_p(1)$ below.

Define

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} = \sum_{k=-n+1}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}}), & k \ge 0; \\ \dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{t=-k+1}^{n}\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t+k}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{\mathrm{T}}), & k < 0. \end{cases}$$

We will specify the convergence rates of $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}|_\infty$ and $|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}|_\infty$, respectively. Notice that

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k) + \sum_{k=-n+1}^{-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k).$$

For any $k \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}_t \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\eta}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}_t (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t-k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k})^{\mathrm{T}} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\eta}_t)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t-k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k})^{\mathrm{T}},$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k) = &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}} - \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}})\}\Big] \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\eta}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\} \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\boldsymbol{\eta}_t(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t-k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k})^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\} \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\eta}_t)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t-k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k})^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

We will prove the $|\cdot|_\infty$-norm of the last three terms on the right-hand side of above identity are $O_p\{sS_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}$. We only need to show this rate for one of them and the proofs for the other two are similar. For any l and t,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\eta}_{l,t} - \widehat{\eta}_{l,t} &= \{\widehat{\epsilon}_{\chi_1(l),t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{\chi_2(l),t} - \epsilon_{\chi_1(l),t}\epsilon_{\chi_2(l),t}\} - \{\widehat{v}_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(l)} - v_{\boldsymbol{\chi}(l)}\} \\ &= \widehat{\epsilon}_{\chi_1(l),t}\widehat{\epsilon}_{\chi_2(l),t} - \epsilon_{\chi_1(l),t}\epsilon_{\chi_2(l),t} + O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} \\ &= \{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_1(l)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_1(l)}\}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t\mathbf{y}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_2(l)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_2(l)}\} - \epsilon_{\chi_2(l),t}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_1(l)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_1(l)}\}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t \\ &\quad - \epsilon_{\chi_1(l),t}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_2(l)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_2(l)}\}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_t + O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here the term $O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}$ is uniform for any l and t. Then the (l_1, l_2)-th component of $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}(k/S_n)\{n^{-1}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\eta}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}}\}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_1(l_1)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_1(l_1)}\}^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\eta_{l_2,t-k}\mathbf{y}_t\mathbf{y}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\Big)\Big\}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_2(l_2)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_2(l_2)}\} \\ &-\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_1(l_1)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_1(l_1)}\}^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\mathbf{y}_t\eta_{l_2,t-k}\epsilon_{\chi_2(l_1),t}\Big)\Big\} \\ &-\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\chi_2(l_1)} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\chi_2(l_1)}\}^{\mathrm{T}}\Big\{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\mathbf{y}_t\eta_{l_2,t-k}\epsilon_{\chi_1(l_1),t}\Big)\Big\} \\ &+ \widetilde{R}_{l_1,l_2},\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\widetilde{R}_{l_1,l_2}| &\leq \left\{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\left|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\right|\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}|\eta_{l_2,t-k}|\Big)\right\}\cdot O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} \\
&\leq \left\{\sum_{k=0}^{n}\left|\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\right|\right\}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}|\eta_{l_2,t}|\Big)\cdot O_p\{(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} \\
&= O_p\{S_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the term $O_p\{S_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}$ is uniform for any l_1 and l_2. Following the same arguments, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{1\leq l_1,l_2\leq p}\left|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\eta_{l_2,t-k}\mathbf{y}_t\mathbf{y}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\Big)\right|_\infty &\leq CS_n, \\
\sup_{1\leq l_1,l_2\leq p}\left|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\mathbf{y}_t\eta_{l_2,t-k}\epsilon_{\chi_2(l_1),t}\Big)\right|_\infty &\leq CS_n, \\
\sup_{1\leq l_1,l_2\leq p}\left|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\mathbf{y}_t\eta_{l_2,t-k}\epsilon_{\chi_1(l_1),t}\Big)\right|_\infty &\leq CS_n.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the (l_1,l_2)-th component of $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}(k/S_n)\{n^{-1}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t-\boldsymbol{\eta}_t)\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}}\}$ can be bounded by

$$
CS_n\sup_{1\leq l\leq p}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_l-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_l|_1+O_p\{S_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}=O_p\{sS_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\},
$$

where the last identity in above equation is based on (22). Therefore, from (45), by Lemma 4, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\big(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k-\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k\big)\right|_\infty \\
&\leq \left|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{K}\Big(\frac{k}{S_n}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}}-\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t-k}^{\mathrm{T}})\}\Big]\right|_\infty+O_p\{sS_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\} \\
&= O_p\big(\{\log(pn)\}^{4/\gamma_2}n^{-f(\alpha_0)/2}\big)+O_p\{sS_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Analogously, we can prove the same result for $|\sum_{k=-n+1}^{-1}\mathcal{K}(k/S_n)(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_k-\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_k)|_\infty$. Therefore,

$$
|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}-\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}|_\infty=O_p\big(\{\log(pn)\}^{4/\gamma_2}n^{-f(\alpha_0)/2}\big)+O_p\{sS_n(n^{-1}\log p)^{1/2}\}.
$$

Repeating the the proof of Proposition 1(b) in Andrews (1991), we know the convergence in Proposition 1(b) is uniformly for each component of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}-\boldsymbol{\Xi}$. Thus, $|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}-\boldsymbol{\Xi}|_\infty=o(1)$. Then

$$
|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}-\boldsymbol{\Xi}|_\infty=o_p(1).
$$

Similar to (33), we complete the proof. □

Proof of Corollary 1: From Theorem 2, it holds that $\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}) \to 1-\alpha$. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\Psi_\alpha = 1) = \mathbb{P}_{H_0}(\mathbf{c} \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}) \to \alpha$ which establishes part (i). For part (ii), the following standard results on Gaussian maximum hold:

$$\mathbb{E}\big(|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty|\mathcal{Y}_n\big) \le \max_{1\le l\le r} \widehat{w}_{l,l}^{1/2} \cdot \{1+(2\log p)^{-1}\}\sqrt{2\log p}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\big\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty \ge \mathbb{E}\big(|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}|_\infty|\mathcal{Y}_n\big) + u|\mathcal{Y}_n\big\} \le \exp\bigg(-\frac{u^2}{2\max_{1\le l\le p}\widehat{w}_{l,l}}\bigg)$$

for any $u>0$. Then,

$$\widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1} \le \max_{1\le l\le r} \widehat{w}_{l,l}^{1/2} \cdot \Big[\{1+(2\log p)^{-1}\}\sqrt{2\log p} + \sqrt{2\log(1/\alpha)}\Big].$$

Let $\mathscr{T}_\varepsilon = \{\max_{1\le l\le r}|\widehat{w}_{l,l}^{1/2} - w_{l,l}^{1/2}|/w_{l,l}^{1/2} \le \varepsilon\}$ for some $\varepsilon>0$. Restricted on $\mathscr{T}_\varepsilon$,

$$\widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1} \le \max_{1\le l\le r} w_{l,l}^{1/2} \cdot (1+\varepsilon)\Big[\{1+(2\log p)^{-1}\}\sqrt{2\log p} + \sqrt{2\log(1/\alpha)}\Big].$$

Let $(\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2) = \arg\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{S}}|\omega_{l_1,l_2}-c_{l_1,l_2}|$. Without lose of generality, we assume $\omega_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}-c_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}>0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{H_1}(\Psi_\alpha=1) &= \mathbb{P}_{H_1}\bigg\{\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{S}} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}-c_{l_1,l_2}| > \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\bigg\} \\
&\ge \mathbb{P}_{H_1}\Big\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}-c_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}) > \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\Big\} \\
&= 1-\mathbb{P}_{H_1}\Big\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}-c_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}) \le \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1},\ \mathscr{T}_\varepsilon\Big\} - \mathbb{P}(\mathscr{T}_\varepsilon^c).
\end{aligned}$$

Restricted on $\mathscr{T}_\varepsilon$, if $\varepsilon\to 0$, it holds that

$$\widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1} - (\omega_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}-c_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}) \le -C\max_{1\le l\le r} w_{l,l}^{1/2}\sqrt{\log p}$$

for some $C>0$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{H_1}\Big\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}-c_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}) \le \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1},\ \mathscr{T}_\varepsilon\Big\} &\le \mathbb{P}_{H_1}\Big\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}-\omega_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}) \le -C\max_{1\le l\le r} w_{l,l}^{1/2}\sqrt{\log p}\Big\} \\
&\to 0.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4, we know that $\max_{1\le l\le r}|\widehat{w}_{l,l}-w_{l,l}| = o_p(1)$ which also implies that $\max_{1\le l\le r}|\widehat{w}_{l,l}^{1/2} - w_{l,l}^{1/2}|/w_{l,l}^{1/2} = o_p(1)$. Then we can choose suitable $\varepsilon\to 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{T}_\varepsilon^c)\to 0$. Hence, we complete part (ii). □

Proof of Corollary 2: Our proof includes two steps: (i) to show $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha}\subset\mathcal{M}_0)\to 1$, and (ii) to show $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_0\subset\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha})\to 1$. Result (i) is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_0^c\subset\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{n,\alpha}^c)\to 1$. The latter one is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}\{\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0^c} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}| \ge \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\}\to 0$. Notice that $\mathcal{S}=\{1,\ldots,p\}^2$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg\{\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0^c} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}| \ge \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\bigg\} \le \mathbb{P}\bigg\{\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{S}} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}-\omega_{l_1,l_2}| \ge \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\bigg\} \le \alpha+o(1),$$

which implies $\mathbb{P}\{\max_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0^c} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}| \geq \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\} \to 0$. Then we construct result (i). Result (ii) is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}\{\min_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}| \leq \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\} \to 0$. Let $(\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2) = \arg\min_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0} |\omega_{l_1,l_2}|$. Without lose of generality, we assume $\omega_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2} > 0$. Notice that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\min_{(l_1,l_2)\in\mathcal{M}_0} n^{1/2}|\widehat{\omega}_{l_1,l_2}| \leq \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1}\Big\} \leq \mathbb{P}\big\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\omega}_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2} - \omega_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}) \leq \widehat{q}_{\mathcal{S},1-\alpha,1} - n^{1/2}\omega_{\tilde{l}_1,\tilde{l}_2}\big\},$$

we can construct result (ii) following the arguments for the proof of Corollary 1. □

References

Andrews, D. W. K. (1991). Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. *Econometrica*, **59**, 817–858.

Bickel, P. and Levina, E. (2008a). Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, **36**, 199–227.

Bickel, P. and Levina, E. (2008b). Covariance regularization by thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, **36**, 2577–2604.

Bühlmann, P. and van de Geer, S. (2011). *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data: Methods, Theory and Applications*. Springer, Heidelberg.

Cai, T. T. and Jiang, T. (2011). Limiting laws of coherence of random matrices with applications to testing covariance structure and construction of compressed sensing matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, **39**, 1496–1525.

Cai, T. T., Liu, W. and Luo, X. (2011). A constrained L_1 minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **106**, 594–607.

Cai, T. T., Liu, W. and Xia, Y. (2013). Two-sample covariance matrix testing and support recovery in high-dimensional and sparse settings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **108**, 265–277.

se Can, A. and Megbolugbe, I. (1997). Spatial dependence and house price index construction. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, **14**, 203–222.

Candes, E. and Tao, T. (2007). The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n. *The Annals of Statistics*, **35**, 2313–2351.

Chang, J., Chen, S. X. and Chen, X. (2015). High dimensional generalized empirical likelihood for moment restrictions with dependent data. *Journal of Econometrics*, **185**, 283–304.

Chang, J., Tang, C. Y. and Wu, Y. (2013). Marginal empirical likelihood and sure independence feature screening. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2123–2148.

Chang, J., Zhou, W. and Zhou, W.-X. (2014). Simulation-based hypothesis testing of high dimensional means under covariance heterogeneity. *arXiv*:1406.1939.

Chen, X., Xu, M. and Wu, W. B. (2013). Covariance and precision matrix estimation for high-dimensional time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2994–3021.

Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D. and Kato, K. (2013). Gaussian approximations and multiplier bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2786–2819.

Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D. and Kato, K. (2014). Testing many moment inequalities. *arXiv*:1312.7614.

Den Haan, W. J. and Levin, A. (1997). A Practioner's Guide to Robust Covariance Matrix Estimation, *Handbook of Statistics 15*, Chapter 12, 291–341.

Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear Time Series*. Springer, New York.

Friedman, J., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2008). Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, **9**, 432–441.

Hochberg, Y. and Tamhane, A. C. (2009). *Multiple Comparison Procedures*. Wiley, New York.

Kiefer, N. M., Vogelsang, T. J. and Bunzel, H. (2000). Simple roubust testing of regression hypothesis. *Econometrica*, **68**, 695–714.

Lahiri, S. N. (2003). *Resampling Methods for Dependent Data*. Springer, Berlin.

Li, J. and Chen, S. X. (2012). Two-sample tests for high-dimensional covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 908–940.

Liu, W. (2013). Gaussian graphical model estimation with false discovery rate control. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2948–2978.

Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2006). High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the Lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, **34**, 1436–1462.

Merlevède, F., Peligrad, M. and Rio, E. (2011). A Bernstein type inequality and moderate deviations for weakly dependent sequences. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **151**, 435–474.

Nordman, D. J. and Lahiri, S. N. (2005). Validity of sampling window method for linear long-range dependent processes. *Econometric Theory*, **21**, 1087–1111.

Peng, J., Wang, P., Zhou, N. and Zhu, J. (2009). Partial correlation estimation by joint sparse regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **104**, 735–746.

Ren, Z., Sun, T., Zhang, C. H. and Zhou, H. (2015). Asymptotic normality and optimalities in estimation of large Gaussian graphical models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **43**, 991–1026.

Sun, T. and Zhang, C. H. (2012). Scaled sparse linear regression. *Biometrika*, **99**, 879–898.

Sun, T. and Zhang, C. H. (2013). Sparse matrix inversion with scaled Lasso. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **14**, 3385–3418.

Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, **B**, **58**, 267–288.

Xue, L. and Zou, H. (2012). Regularized rank-based estimation of high-dimensional nonparanormal graphical models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 2541–2571.

Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2007). Model selection and estimation in the Gaussian graphical model. *Biometrika*, **94**, 19–35.

Table 1: Averages of empirical coverage and their standard deviations (in parentheses) for $p = 50$.

Covariance Structure	ρ	$1-\alpha$	$n = 150$				$n = 300$			
			$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : \omega_{j_1,j_2} = 0\}$		$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : j_1 \neq j_2\}$		$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : \omega_{j_1,j_2} = 0\}$		$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : j_1 \neq j_2\}$	
			KMB	SKMB	KMB	SKMB	KMB	SKMB	KMB	SKMB
A	0	0.925	0.946(0.016)	0.879(0.010)	0.884(0.026)	0.938(0.009)	0.942(0.013)	0.919(0.005)	0.898(0.018)	0.932(0.006)
		0.950	0.967(0.014)	0.917(0.005)	0.921(0.023)	0.940(0.005)	0.965(0.010)	0.943(0.002)	0.927(0.015)	0.945(0.004)
		0.975	0.988(0.008)	0.953(0.004)	0.956(0.013)	0.963(0.004)	0.986(0.006)	0.966(0.002)	0.960(0.009)	0.970(0.003)
	0.3	0.925	0.934(0.021)	0.905(0.010)	0.843(0.030)	0.893(0.012)	0.930(0.014)	0.916(0.017)	0.869(0.023)	0.905(0.009)
		0.950	0.956(0.014)	0.932(0.009)	0.882(0.024)	0.926(0.010)	0.954(0.011)	0.948(0.007)	0.904(0.017)	0.942(0.008)
		0.975	0.979(0.008)	0.967(0.005)	0.930(0.017)	0.964(0.005)	0.977(0.006)	0.968(0.004)	0.940(0.013)	0.971(0.004)
B	0	0.925	0.937(0.016)	0.953(0.011)	0.861(0.027)	0.892(0.007)	0.929(0.009)	0.926(0.006)	0.912(0.017)	0.920(0.006)
		0.950	0.966(0.009)	0.928(0.008)	0.897(0.022)	0.929(0.007)	0.958(0.008)	0.945(0.005)	0.936(0.011)	0.940(0.005)
		0.975	0.986(0.005)	0.960(0.004)	0.941(0.015)	0.961(0.004)	0.980(0.003)	0.972(0.001)	0.960(0.008)	0.972(0.003)
	0.3	0.925	0.938(0.017)	0.897(0.010)	0.815(0.034)	0.869(0.014)	0.933(0.016)	0.900(0.009)	0.873(0.023)	0.890(0.012)
		0.950	0.964(0.015)	0.932(0.010)	0.868(0.034)	0.914(0.011)	0.958(0.011)	0.942(0.007)	0.911(0.016)	0.936(0.008)
		0.975	0.986(0.009)	0.962(0.008)	0.931(0.019)	0.958(0.009)	0.981(0.005)	0.973(0.004)	0.945(0.011)	0.969(0.005)

Table 2: Averages of empirical coverage and their standard deviations (in parentheses) for $p = 100$.

Covariance Structure	ρ	$1-\alpha$	$n = 150$				$n = 300$			
			$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : \omega_{j_1,j_2} = 0\}$		$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : j_1 \neq j_2\}$		$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : \omega_{j_1,j_2} = 0\}$		$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_1, j_2) : j_1 \neq j_2\}$	
			KMB	SKMB	KMB	SKMB	KMB	SKMB	KMB	SKMB
A	0	0.925	0.948(0.011)	0.956(0.006)	0.909(0.018)	0.934(0.007)	0.943(0.009)	0.935(0.005)	0.911(0.015)	0.932(0.005)
		0.950	0.970(0.008)	0.976(0.005)	0.935(0.013)	0.961(0.005)	0.965(0.006)	0.962(0.003)	0.936(0.013)	0.958(0.003)
		0.975	0.985(0.004)	0.990(0.002)	0.962(0.008)	0.980(0.003)	0.983(0.003)	0.980(0.002)	0.970(0.008)	0.978(0.002)
	0.3	0.925	0.938(0.017)	0.959(0.009)	0.860(0.023)	0.916(0.010)	0.927(0.008)	0.923(0.007)	0.899(0.014)	0.918(0.007)
		0.950	0.963(0.012)	0.973(0.006)	0.899(0.021)	0.943(0.006)	0.953(0.006)	0.952(0.006)	0.929(0.013)	0.946(0.007)
		0.975	0.985(0.006)	0.986(0.003)	0.942(0.013)	0.982(0.004)	0.984(0.003)	0.976(0.002)	0.962(0.007)	0.980(0.003)
B	0	0.925	0.905(0.013)	0.953(0.005)	0.851(0.025)	0.890(0.007)	0.913(0.009)	0.935(0.005)	0.906(0.014)	0.911(0.006)
		0.950	0.962(0.012)	0.935(0.004)	0.895(0.023)	0.917(0.005)	0.957(0.006)	0.949(0.004)	0.933(0.011)	0.938(0.004)
		0.975	0.965(0.006)	0.986(0.003)	0.948(0.014)	0.955(0.004)	0.968(0.004)	0.980(0.003)	0.963(0.008)	0.966(0.004)
	0.3	0.925	0.943(0.013)	0.905(0.007)	0.811(0.034)	0.868(0.009)	0.940(0.010)	0.917(0.007)	0.867(0.019)	0.902(0.008)
		0.950	0.960(0.010)	0.938(0.005)	0.862(0.025)	0.905(0.007)	0.958(0.008)	0.945(0.005)	0.907(0.017)	0.932(0.007)
		0.975	0.981(0.006)	0.963(0.004)	0.915(0.017)	0.947(0.007)	0.980(0.004)	0.971(0.004)	0.949(0.010)	0.966(0.006)